

823SH1  
9 II SH15

# SHAKESPEARIANA.

"Age cannot wither nor custom stale his infinite variety."—ANT. & CLEO.

VOL. I.

NOVEMBER, 1883.

No. 1.

## "CURST BE HE THAT MOVES MY BONES!"

[Suggested by reading of a movement on foot in England for opening Shakespeare's grave.]

SMALL reverence hath this scientific age  
For prophet, martyr, poet, or the sage  
Of long ago. This is an age of measures ;  
And, by its rules, much honored, ancient treasures,  
On which our ancestors have set great store,  
And counted oft the precious value o'er,  
May something lack ; at which our time's conceit  
Would brand such relic as a counterfeit.  
'Twere folly worse than idle to deride  
That scientific training of the mind  
By which old fallacies were laid aside ;  
But let us not go on too fast, nor find  
Naught hath a measure, that can not be weighed ;  
No value set, save by a Board of Trade ;  
Naught wise, but where the proof fits in as pat  
As the smooth lining in a brand new hat.  
What measure hath the beautiful ? how tell  
What values in remembrances that dwell  
Deep in our hearts beyond the reach of rule  
Or formula of philosophic school ?  
Though modern science claims 'tis very plain  
Memories are written in the folded brain,  
We *feel* them in our hearts ; and feeling knows  
Profounder wisdom than our science shows,  
At least in things of heart, where still remain  
Our loves and memories mauger claims of brain.  
The spiritual, fanciful, ideal —  
Who shall bring down these lightly soaring wings,  
The harmonies the enraptured spirit sings,  
And tell us what they weigh ? 'Tis true, we pull  
The planet from its orbit to our scale ;  
But there are things where measures naught avail.

[Copyright, 1883, by THE LEONARD SCOTT PUBLISHING CO. All rights reserved.]

215700

"CURST BE HE THAT MOVES MY BONES."

Then leave us still a realm in which the soul  
Hath knowledge other than by weight and rule,  
Where thought may revel free and fanciful  
With no material stay or harsh control —  
The realm of poesy. A traitor he  
Who enters here with aught of heresy  
Born of material science, or would try  
By critic canons worth of poetry.  
O worse the traitor that would rub the gold  
From shining wings to prove their poverty,  
Or take away the glory that of old  
His songs divine, his charming minstrelsy,  
Have hung, a halo, round a poet's name,  
And built the palace of his deathless fame !  
E'en worse is he would dig a poet's bones  
Out of their grave to prove a theory,  
Profane his last request, nor "spare these stones,"  
Deaf to the pathos of an epitaph  
That wakes an echo in each feeling breast,  
Crying responsive for the poet's rest,  
And if some scientist — with critic laugh  
At sentiment, to which his soul is dull  
And irresponsible while his mind is bent  
On morbid purpose and unclean intent —  
Would gauge the size of Shakespeare's moldered skull,  
Let the loud protest rise throughout the lands  
That love the poet, and arrest his hands.  
Pah ! cries the Hamlet of the stage as he  
Handles dead Yorick's fleshless head, so we  
Cry shame on him would stir the sacred rest  
Of our loved bard, the sweetest and the best  
Of all the singers of our English tongue,  
Whose fame is old, whose voice is ever young.

*William Leighton Jr.*

---

## THE PORTRAITS OF SHAKESPEARE.



THE STRATFORD BUST.

### I. THE STRATFORD BUST.

THE Stratford Bust is the oldest, and probably the best authenticated, of all the representations of Shakespeare which have come down to us. It is erected on the north side of the chancel of Holy Trinity Church, at Stratford-on-Avon. It is on the inside wall of the chancel, about five or six feet from the floor. On the floor of the chancel, in front of the monument are the graves of Shakespeare and his family.

The bust is surrounded by an entablature composed of black marble Corinthian columns, with gilded capitals and bases; and above the bust is an arch surmounting the niche in which it rests. Above are the arms of Shakespeare, on either side of which are two cherubim, one of whom holds a spade, and the other has an inverted torch, and rests his hand on a skull. On the apex of the monument is another skull.

Exactly when the monument and bust were erected we have no means of ascertaining, but probably shortly after Shakespeare's death,—which occurred in 1616. Certain it is that when the First Folio edition of

his works was published, in 1623, it contained these lines :

### TO THE MEMORIE

OF THE DECEASED AUTHOUR MAISTER

W. SHAKESPEARE.

SHAKE-SPEARE, at length thy pious fellowes giue  
The world thy Workes : thy Workes, by which,  
out-live

Thy Tombe, thy name must, when that stone is  
rent,

And Time dissolues thy STRATFORD Monument,  
Here we alieue shall view thee still. This  
Booke,

When Brasse and Marble fade, shall make thee  
looke

Fresh to all Ages : when Posteritie  
Shall loath what's new, thinke all is prodegie  
That is not SHAKE-SPEARES ; eu'ry Line, each  
Verse

Here shall reuiue, redeeme thee from thy Herse.  
Nor Fire, nor cankring Age, as NASO said,  
Of his, thy wit-fraught Booke shall once inuade.  
Nor shall I e're belecue, or thinke thee dead

(Though mist) untill our bankrout Stage be sped  
 (Impossible) with some new straine t' out-do  
 Passions of IULIET, and her ROMEO ;  
 Or till J heare a Scene more nobly take,  
 Then when thy half-sword parlying ROMANS  
 spake.  
 Till these, till any of thy Volumes rest  
 Shall with more fire, more feeling be exprest,  
 Be sure, our SHAKE-SPEARE, thou canst neuer  
 dye,

But crown'd with Lawrell, liue eternally.

L. DIGGES.

The words, "And time dissolues thy Stratford Monument," evidently refer to the present one; which has remained from the date of its erection to the present time.

Underneath the cushion in front of the bust is the following inscription :

IVDICIO PYLIVM, GENIO SOCRATEM, ARTE MARONEM,  
 TERRA TEGIT, POPVLVS MÆRET, OLYMPVS HABET.

STAY PASSENGER, WHY GOEST THOV BY SO FAST?  
 READ IF THOV CANST, WHOM ENVIOUS DEATH HATH PLAST,  
 WITH IN THIS MONVMENT SHAKESPEARE WITH WHOME  
 QUICK NATVRE DIDE : WHOSE NAME DOTH DECK Y<sup>e</sup> TOMBE  
 FAR MORE THEN COST SIEH ALL Y<sup>t</sup> HE HATH WRITT,  
 LEAVES LIVING ART, BVT PAGE, TO SERVE HIS WITT :

OBITU ANNO D<sup>ni</sup> 1616

ÆTATIS, 53, DIE 23 AP.

The bust is cut out of a bluish limestone. Beginning at the shoulders, the back of the figure is hollowed out to allow of its fitting further back in the niche.

The columns on either side of the bust are now of black marble, polished, and their capitals and bases are of freestone. "The whole of the entablatures were formerly of white alabaster, but when the monument was repaired in 1749, the architraves being decayed, new ones of marble were substituted; but no other material alteration, if we except that of the old colors, seems to have been made in the original." (Halliwell-Phillipps, *Folio Edition of Shakespeare*, London: 1853, folio, Vol. I, p. 230.)

The bust was originally painted in colors to resemble life. The face and hands were of a flesh color; the eyes of a light hazel; the hair and the beard were auburn. The doublet was painted scarlet, and the loose gown without sleeves worn over it, was black. In 1749 the monument was repaired, but great care was taken to preserve the original colors. In 1793 it was painted of a uniform white, by order of Malone, to satisfy his classical taste, which was offended by the colors. Apart from the vandalism of thus injuring so interesting and valuable a relic of the great poet, he seems to have forgotten that the Greeks frequently colored their statues.

About twenty years ago this white paint was removed by Mr. Collins, of London. Enough of the old coloring remained under the white paint to enable it to be restored to its original colors. Any one who has seen a cast from the bust in a white or gray state,

would hardly know it for the same statue as the colored one, so much does the coloring alter the expression.

The bust was either sculptured by Gerard Johnson, who was a native of Amsterdam (and who afterwards came to London), or by one of his sons. Dugdale, in his *Life, Diary, etc.*, 1827, 4to., p. 99, says: "Shakespeares and John Combes monuments, at Stratford super Avon, made by one Gerard Johnson." As a work of art Combe's is inferior to Shakespeare's bust. A celebrated sculptor, Sir Francis Chantrey, was of opinion that the head of the figure was made from a cast, taken from a human face. Bell was also of this opinion. J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps in his *Folio Edition of Shakespeare*, London: 1853, Vol. I, p. 230, says:

"The bust, when minutely examined, contains indications of individuality that render such a supposition" [*i. e.*, that it was a fanciful likeness] "altogether inadmissible; for no artist, working either from a picture, or relying on memory, description, or imagination would have introduced the peculiarities which belong to it, amongst which may be especially noticed the slight but singular fall of the cheek under the right eye, which has been attributed to the sculptor copying from a cast taken after death. The forehead and the formation of the head should alone be decisive evidences in favour of its authenticity. There is, in truth, a convincing and a mental likeness in this monument, one that grows upon us by contemplation and makes us unwilling to accept any other resemblance. If it has fallen beneath a cloud, the reason must be sought for in the circumstance that an

image, the composition of which derives no assistance from the ideal, can scarcely be expected to satisfy the imagination in the delineation of features belonging to so great an intellect. But to those who can bring themselves to believe that, notwithstanding his unrivaled genius, Shakespeare was a realization of existence, and in his daily career, much as other men were, the bust at Stratford will convey very nearly all that it is desirable to know of his outward form."

It is strange how differently people look at the same object. Hear J. Hain Friswell: (*Life Portraits of William Shakespeare*. London: 1864, 4to., p. 6):

"Like the monument itself, it will probably disappoint many people. It is heavy, not very intellectual, and certainly not sculptured by any one having claims to be considered an artist."

Again, on p. 10, he says:

"The skull of the figure, rudely cut and heavy, without any feeling, is a mere block; a phrenologist would be puzzled at its smoothness and roundness. It has no more individuality or power in it than a boy's marble. The cheeks are fat and sensual, the neck just rounded out of the soft stone; the linen collar of the dress like a sheet of bent block tin."

Dr. C. M. Ingleby read a paper before the Royal Society of Literature, of London, in 1874, on the "Portraiture of Shakespeare" in the course of which he characterized the bust "as coarse and clownish, suggesting to the beholder a countryman crunching a sour apple or struck with amazement at some unpleasant spectacle, an unintentional caricature, yet full of force and practical power."

James Boaden, the author of *An Inquiry into the Authenticity of various Pictures and Prints, which from the decease of the Poet to our own times, have been offered to the public as Portraits of Shakspeare*, London: 1824, 8vo., on page 31 of that work says:

"The contour of the head is well given. The lips are very carefully carved; but the eyes appear to me to be of a very poor character: the curves of the lids have no grace—the eyes themselves no protecting prominences of bone, and the whole of this important feature is tame and superficial."

Abraham Wivell, a portrait painter, and author of *An Inquiry into the History, Authenticity, and Characteristics of the Shakspeare Portraits*, London: 1827, 8vo., does not believe that the bust was modeled from a cast from Shakespeare's face. On page 140 he says:

"The nose and forehead are fine; and were

it not for a rather disproportionate length from the former to the mouth, the face would be remarkably handsome. It has a more fleshy appearance than any of the other portraits, and has much less of the look of a Jew than most of them, as his beard is trimmed to the fashion of the time."

Some years ago William Page, a celebrated artist, made a study of the principal portraits of Shakespeare, for the purpose of making a bust of the poet. His views about the Stratford Bust are particularly valuable. In his *Study of Shakespeare's Portraits*, London: 1876, 24mo. p. 16, he says:

"The most inexpert observer may see, by placing a cast of it beside a fine antique or an excellent modern portrait, what I mean when I say that it shows very crude and unskilled modelling. This does not mean that it may not have individual characteristics. Artists and others have always known that the eyes were impossible, the nose worked off too short, or the end of it never reached, as the spot where it should join the upper lip is still marked in the bust; and had the nose started out at right angles to the lip at that place, instead of slanting up to its present point, truth and beauty each would have been subserved. Though carelessly, falsely, and hence wickedly misinterpreted in many ways, still there are fixed facts in this bust which make it valuable in some points of likeness. \* \* \* \* \* The left side is flattened away from the mouth back toward the middle of the cheek. This was probably a true characteristic of his" [*i. e.*, Gerard Johnson's] "model. Then the lower part of his cheek is fattened out and made very full under the jaw. This characteristic is probably exaggerated if it existed at all, the sculptor supposing that the flesh of the cheeks in the reclining posture fell back, and should be replaced in this manner, since he represented the subject upright. On the right side of the mouth there is a contrasting fullness of the cheek, and then a falling away diagonally to the jaw, from which, around to the throat, you find the line less curved than on the other side. The individual character of this one-sidedness, which exists some way in every face, was doubtless founded on a mask from nature, and is exactly graded, recorded and interpreted in the German Mask. The Greeks valued these natural inequalities. The Venus of Milo's face is one-sided, and the Theseus's eyebrows unlike.

"I should have stated before that when I speak of right and left side I mean Shakespeare's, and not the observer's.

"In the Stratford bust the lower lip is peculiar, the right side being sensibly fuller and

hanging down lower than the left side. It is crudely rendered, yet a fact safely lodged there can never be ousted. There is also an indentation at the left corner of the mouth, more accentuated than on the other side, which is dragged down rather vertically toward the chin.

"The sculptor certainly had some guide for these varieties of undulations. The luckiest guess does not hit in a portrait. These peculiarities exist in the mask, where they are seen not to have been exaggerated by death."

F. W. Fairholt, F. S. A., made a very careful drawing of the bust for Halliwell-Phillips' *Folio Edition of Shakespeare*, and was much impressed by the excellence with which the monument was executed. He believed the face to have been "sculptured with singular delicacy and care" except the eyes. The shortness of the nose, and the unusual length of the upper lip in the Stratford bust has been frequently noticed and commented upon. In 1814 George Bullock was permitted to take the bust down from its niche, for the purpose of making a plaster cast from the face. A short time after making the cast, Mr. Bullock invited Sir Walter Scott, Benjamin West, Dr. Spurzheim, and John Britton, the antiquary, to breakfast with him. It was on this occasion that Bullock made a cast of Scott's head. These gentlemen discussed the cast of Shakespeare, which Britton had made from the Stratford Bust, and Scott particularly commented on the great space between the nose and the upper lip. Bullock declared that Scott had the same peculiarity to an even greater extent than Shakespeare, as shown in this bust. A pair of compasses were produced and Scott's upper lip was found to be the longer of the two.

There was originally a stone pen in the right hand of the bust, but the story is, that a young man who had taken it out of the fingers to examine it, dropped it on the floor of the chancel, where it was broken to pieces. A quill pen dipped in ink now replaces it.

To most people the bust is at first sight disappointing—especially if seen in its colored state. It grows upon one, however, the more it is looked at, and a white or gray cast from it becomes very pleasing after long familiarity with it.

Certain it is that it was erected shortly after Shakespeare's death, and probably by some of his family. It was put in a conspicuous place in the chancel of his native church, and in the sight of his fellow townsmen. Even if we admit that its sculptor

was nothing more than a "tombe-maker," as he undoubtedly was, still the bust must have had strong points of resemblance to the poet or it would not have been accepted. Rudely cut it certainly is, and it possesses no claims to being a work of art.

Its appearance is very different when viewed from different positions. Looked at from underneath the very fleshy appearance of the cheeks and the throat is especially noticeable. Seen from a level the effect is much better, while a three-quarters view is the most pleasing. The nose is certainly very short, and the tradition that it met with an accident while the sculptor was working at it would not seem altogether improbable, if we did not remember that other faces have been met with in life with the same peculiarity—notably that of Sir Walter Scott, as already referred to.

A great number of engravings have been executed which pretend to represent the bust, but the large majority of them utterly fail to do so.

An engraving by G. Vertue, published in Vol. I. of Pope's edition of Shakespeare, London: 1725, 4to. gives the monument (vol. I, p. xxxi.) with tolerable accuracy, except that one of the cherubim is represented with a candle instead of the spade which he really holds in his hand, and has his other hand resting on an hour glass instead of a rock; while the other cherub is seated on the skull instead of holding his hand on it, and has the torch in his hand upright, instead of inverted, as it is. But the bust as represented in this picture has the head taken from the Chandos portrait! It is a striking illustration of the inaccuracy of some of the older engravers.

H. Gravelot has evidently copied Vertue's plate for Hanmer's edition of Shakespeare, London: 1744, 4to. (Vol. I, p. xxxiii.), for it is almost an exact copy of it, except that the hair is not as well engraved. The Chandos head appears on the bust in this plate also. The same plate of Gravelot's was used in Hanmer's second edition of Shakespeare, London: 1771, 4to. (Vol. I, p. xxii.)

Rowe's edition of Shakespeare, London: 1709, 16mo. (Vol. I, p. xxxvii.) contains an engraving of the monument and bust which is laughable. The cherubim are represented as balancing themselves over the top of it, with their legs hanging down; the one who should have the torch inverted holding an hour glass, and the other holding up the spade instead of leaning on it. The head of the bust looks more like the Chandos portrait than the bust, while Shakespeare is represented as patting a pillow with both

hands instead of resting his hands on the cushion, as in the bust. Only two lines of the inscription underneath are given. A poor copy of this print, engraved by Grignon, appeared in Bell's Edition of Shakespeare, London: 1788, 24mo., (Vol. II, p. 468. The plate is dated 1786.)

The earliest engraving of the bust that did it anything like justice was published in Boydell's Folio Edition of Shakespeare. London: 1802, folio, Vol. I. It is engraved by J. Neagle.

A very handsome mezzotint representing only the bust, engraved by William Ward (?) and published by J. Britton, 1816, is the next that claims our attention. By many this is considered the most striking engraving of the bust ever published.

W. T. Fry engraved a plate from a cast by Bullock, published in 1817 by Caddell and Davies, London, which has some merit.

R. Smirke was a fair artist, but he ought to have been ashamed of himself to paint such a picture of the bust as R. Ashby engraved, and Hurst, Robinson & Co. published *circa* 1820. It no more resembles the bust than any living creature.

All of the above mentioned engravings represented the bust as all white, but the first one that showed it in colors was engraved by W. Finden from a drawing by J. Thurston, and published by W. Walner, in 1820. The lower part of the jaw is very badly done. This same plate, very much worn, was afterwards used in Charles Cowden Clarke's *Shakespeare Characters*, London: 1863, 8vo.

E. Scriven engraved a handsome plate of

the head and shoulders of the bust, from a drawing by J. Boaden, published in Boaden's *Inquiry*, London: 1824, 8vo. It represents the bust as white, and the cheeks are too fleshy, but the top of the head is very fine.

A. Wivell drew a fine picture of the bust, which was well engraved in stipple by I. S. Agar, and published by George Lawford in 1825. It shows the bust in its white state, and the view is almost directly in front. It is of the bust only.

Another drawing by Wivell, engraved by F. A. Dean, and published in Wivell's *Inquiry*, London: 1827, 8vo. is of the head and shoulders only, and is not as successful as the one above mentioned. It shows the bust white.

An excellent photograph of the bust and monument in its present colored state was published by John Burton & Sons in 1864. The camera has evidently been placed on a level with the bust in taking the negative, and the result is therefore very satisfactory.

Two fine photographs of the bust, (but taken from a white cast,) showing a front and side view, accompany Gabriel Harrison's privately printed brochure on *The Stratford Bust*, Brooklyn: 1865, 4to.

Numerous photographs have since been taken, all of which give a better idea of the bust than engravings do—unless the latter are made from them.

Quite recently the New Shakespeare Society has issued a large colored chromo-lithograph of the bust.

The engraving that accompanies this article was made from a photograph, and is an accurate representation of the bust.

*J. Parker Norris*

## KING LEAR'S ARRANGEMENT WITH HIS DAUGHTERS.

"I do invest you jointly with my power,  
Pre-eminence, and all the large effects  
That troop with majesty.—Ourselves, by monthly course,  
With reservation of an hundred knights  
By you to be sustain'd, shall our abode  
Make with you by due turn. Only, we shall retain  
The name, and all th' addition to a King;  
The sway, revenue, execution of the rest,  
Beloved sons, be yours."—(LEAR, I, 1, 132-140.)

IN the story of *Lear*, Shakespeare follows the old tradition as it had come down to him from a remote antiquity. He most likely followed Holinshed, who took it from French and Latin sources. But behind all these, there probably will be found an old Celtic kernel to the story, which later writers have modified in accordance with their own ideas of what would render the tragedy of ingratitude and cruelty more pathetic.

The lines I have quoted are interesting to the sociologist as containing a reminiscence of an old Celtic usage, which gives us a clue to the original shape of the story, and enables us to relieve it of much of its improbability. Every reader must have been struck with the absurdity of *Lear's* divesting himself of his royal power in favor of his two sons-in-law, or rather of his two daughters, the Jezebels of the drama. He is not a feeble old dotard; he is a man in the full vigor of his mind, and quick—as only the vigorous are—to resent in act as well as word whatever touches his dignity. His very madness comes upon him through the want of that senile feebleness which yields with sighs to the encroachments of ingratitude. But the story as Shakespeare found it and as he left it, is forced to depict him in the first act as divesting himself of power and its responsibilities, because of a weakness which would have made the rest of his fate impossible.

The clue to the matter is that the later French and English versions of the story misrepresented what *Lear* did at the start, because they did not understand the old Celtic usage upon which his act rested itself. As everybody knows the Celtic constitution of society was the tribal. The picture of old Irish society, which Sir Henry Sumner Maine has drawn from the old Brehon laws, and presented in his *Primitive Institutions*, is the most complete we possess of old Celtic usages. The tribe is properly an artificial extension of the natural family as we still have it. It is formed by the descendants of a common head remaining together for mutual defense

and other advantages, when the death of their common head, the grandfather or great grandfather of the youngest generation, might have scattered them. They accept some one of his children as taking his place at their head, and acknowledge the succession to this chieftainship as inhering in some one natural family of the group. The chieftainship is not a salaried position. He lives by his own flocks, herds and hands, and from his own wealth sustains his dignity as judge in peace and general in war. When several tribes unite for mutual defense, the chief of one becomes the patriarch of all, and it may happen that all the rest are adopted as sons of the ancestor whose name is borne by this leading tribe. These large unities raise the question of the chieftain's financial relationship to his clansmen. They do not live with him; they are scattered over a territory for which he has the responsibility. He must maintain a military force sufficient for all the emergencies of invasion within that territory. To do so unaided would exhaust his personal estate. How can he get their aid?

Money they have none, or next to none. But they have houseroom, and food, and usquebaugh or some primitive anticipation of it. They can give him and his warriors entertainment if nothing else. He cannot collect taxes, but he can "board around" among his clansmen. This was actually the first attempt at a fiscal system among the Celts, and probably among other primitive peoples also. The King or Kingling had a fixed tariff of obligations, according to which he spent his time with the subdivisions of the tribe or kingdom. In the *Celtic Book of Rights*, translated by Dr. O'Donovan—father of the brilliant war correspondent—there is an enumeration of the rights of the Kings of Ireland in this respect. It specifies the number of days he may stay in each of the places mentioned.

*Lear's* procedure was to accept his sons-in-law as chief tenants under his authority, with reserve of his rights of "maintenance"

as the English called it when they came into Ireland. He did not divest himself of his royalty, although his sons-in-law may have borne, in the oldest version of the story, a title as dignified as his own. They may have been called kings, just as he was, and this may have helped to mislead the French and English transmitters of the legend. In Ireland the chief ruler of the Island, and the rulers of any of its provinces, bore the same name. *Lear* was still King, truly retaining

"The name and all the addition to a King"

and asserting the claim by this periodical quartering of himself and his "hundred knights" on his sons-in-law. He gave nothing that stripped him of his royal dignity. But he gave what furnished his unnatural children with the means of deposing him from it. Just as under the somewhat similar

arrangements of the feudal system, vassals enriched by the king's grants, sometimes used their wealth to destroy their benefactors. So these sub-chiefs used theirs against their father and chieftain.

This, I take it, was the first shape of the story. But it fell into the hands of those who knew nothing of the right of maintenance, and who supposed the arrangement made for his support to mean that he had abdicated his power. Thus taken the story became less commonplace and more pathetic than it had been in the original shape. It was the act of a fond father, who gave up every thing to children who proved to be without natural affection, and whose ingratitude stands out all the blacker against the background of his trustfulness. That the act of distribution was more than a little silly did not matter, as it made the tragedy the more touching and pathetic.

*R. E. Thompson*

---

SHAKESPEARE.

How marvelous that out of far-off time,  
Sounding through centuries of echoing years,  
One voice, above all voices, fills our ears :  
Clear over all ring out its tones sublime  
In stately verse, or laughing into rhyme,  
Stirring our hearts to gladness or to tears  
With trooping images of hopes and fears !  
As full it sounds to-day, as in its prime  
It filled with melody a golden age ;  
Nor hath it lost one charm, or wizard spell  
To wake the passions, or their fury quell —  
O sweet enchanter, O magician sage,  
Still o'er each living age employ thy arts,  
Binding to thee by golden words all hearts.

---

## THE INTRODUCTION OF SHAKESPEARE INTO THE SCHOOLS.

" 'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wish'd."

No attempt will be made within the narrow limits of this paper to discuss fully the importance of the introduction of the study of Shakespeare into the school-life of America. To be suggestive, not argumentative, is what is here sought. Some of the considerations, however, which have had decisive weight with many of our schools, will be very briefly urged in the hope of influencing other schools to follow their good example. These considerations are not novel, nor are they original with the writer in any special sense; but they deserve repetition all the more because they have the sanction of time and experience, even though that repetition be an old story to many persons.

The growth of the study of English in our schools of late years has been as marked as gratifying to all true patriots; for love of country and love of native literature go hand in hand. And among the causes leading to this result, a most potent one has been the excellent work of a number of accomplished and devoted Shakespeare scholars, some of whom have published admirable school editions of his plays. In so doing they have performed an immense service to Shakespeare and to the school public. The aim of these editions is to render the text readily intelligible and therefore the spirit of Shakespeare more appreciable by young people. Supplemented by grammatical, historical, and æsthetic works, they form a body of school literature unsurpassed in educational value. When so used, the scope of their aim includes a knowledge of Shakespeare as he appears in any particular play, or more broadly, a knowledge of Shakespeare and of the English speech as contained in the play. For, whatever may be true of student life beyond school walls, it is not enough in the school itself to study Shakespeare from any one point of view. School-work demands such a manifold iteration of the subject as will show its true relations, and if possible all its true relations.

We may note, then, the following points, all most desirable for the American youth, as substantial reasons for the introduction of Shakespeare as a text-book into our schools. In the first place he wrote such *good English*. No man has ever surpassed him in that, as all the world knows; and to store the mind with

his strong speech is to furnish it with the best thing possible. His English is soon found to involve some *historical study* of the language. For the average student that fact of historical English study is of considerable value in giving dignity to his conception of his mother-tongue and in showing how much closer than generally supposed is that bond of Race which draws the present so near to the past. Further, the *varying functions* of the terminations and of the words themselves in Elizabethan English not only show the powers, still possessed in part, by the language, but help to rid the mind of many fallacious notions learned from ill-digested books in earlier school-life. The *history* in Shakespeare might well be studied as an independent matter. For it is hardly too much to say that, in so far as England goes, we might speak of the "Shakespeare theory" of English history with as much accuracy as we could of the "Miltonic theory" of the universe. Henry V. and Richard III., for most of us, are Shakespeare's henceforth, no matter what sober historians may say. And Shakespeare as well as Green has a "history of the English people," legible to him who chooses to read and, in many particulars, having the authenticity of an eye-witness. As a study of practical *rhetoric*, that is, of the method of so using language as to attain the greatest clearness, strength, beauty, sublimity, Shakespeare is a fine text-book. Especially well does he teach how often even good rhetoric is exactly what is not wanted. The expansion and proper arrangement of his crowded and condensed figures of speech is sometimes a revelation to students of the real meaning of the figures, at the same time that it makes plain the necessity for clear grammatical construction and for the avoidance of figures on the part of a less powerful genius. In the formation of *style*, Shakespeare is singularly beneficial to young writers. Being, as is commonly observed, the "least mannered of all the poets," he yet has an almost unmistakable style. He does not invite imitation. Every body feels the force of Dryden's couplet—

"But Shakespeare's magic could not copied be,  
Within that circle none durst walk but he."

None the less do his forceful words awake

the desire to do what he does—vain though such desire be. He has the effect of stimulating his students to the most energetic expression of which they are capable, and yet of developing whatever is original within them. As an incentive to *self-education* there is nothing better than Shakespeare. No matter what the after life is to be, all pupils need this training which comes from the effort to decide on what they do really think. Here the school training and the life-education are merged; the work is done by the pupil for himself, the teacher only giving to the reproduction of thought, form and correction as to detail. In the world of such a play as *Hamlet*, for instance, there arise innumerable questions of good and bad taste, of frankness and dishonesty of utterance as of thought, of wisdom and unwisdom of speech or deed. For the pupil considering these things, "the question" is not alone "to be or not to be," it is also to think or not to think, to do or not to do. While following the career of that strangely troubled soul, the pupil too must feel, through his own profound sympathy, the stress of those mortal questions which *Hamlet* had to face, and much of a boy's life afterwards may depend upon the answers which he is conscious of making to those questions in the class-room.

The *æsthetic* study, whether consciously or unconsciously *æsthetic*, involved in working carefully over one of Shakespeare's masterpieces, is for many a pupil the most valuable moral lesson which he ever gets. As a teacher of sound morals indeed, Shakespeare has that superiority over text-book of ethics which actual life has over sermons. Even when, as in *King Lear*, wrong seems to triumph, the "terror and pity" of the scene leave no sound heart in doubt as to the true moral of the tragic action; and when, as in the case of *Prince Hal*, the poet seems indifferent to

right or wrong in his exuberant pursuit of *Falstaff* and fun, we have only to turn to *Prince Hal* become *King Henry V.*, "all alive with the highest and purest Christian *ethos*," as Mr. Hudson so ably points out, in order to see how firmly the real conviction of Shakespeare, as poet and man, is based upon fundamental moral principles. Not that Shakespeare is a teacher of cant, nor of sanctimoniousness, nor even of creed. But there is as true religion in the filial prayer of deep-souled *Cordelia*:

"O you kind gods,  
Cure this great breach in his abused nature!  
The untuned and jarring senses, O, wind up  
Of this child-changed father!"

as there is in the awe-stricken ejaculation of upright *Banquo*:

"Fears and scruples shake us:  
In the great hand of God I stand—"

Most persons probably would have to read twice before distinguishing between the heathen and the Christian in these two speeches. Of still greater importance to us as a people is the aspect of Shakespeare as the greatest soul in our *language* and of our *race*. There is no bond in the life of a people so strong as speech, since that is not only the dwelling place of the national soul, but is also the atmosphere vital to its being and growth. If the American people is to remain true to its origin and worthy of its heritage from the race of Shakespeare, he must be studied by the American boys and girls. Nowhere else in our literature, is to be found so much of the ancestral instinct and passion for general and individual *freedom*, the greatest contribution of the Teuton to modern civilization. That freedom must be preserved, and in its preservation the school can and should do a greater work than the halls of legislation. May they see their duty clearly and follow it closely.

Wm Taylor Thorne

## AN UNPRIZED MAID.

SOME of us play-goers who have been most sensitive to Salvini's masterly interpretation of *Lear* have paid a certain penalty for the pleasure.

We have suffered not merely that obvious drawback from the level greatness of the play taken as a whole involved in seeing only one part adequately represented. We have felt, also, at times, an appreciable hindrance in getting a just impression of the related values of the characters as Shakespeare conceived them. Salvini not only dwarfs the other actors, he dwarfs the other parts unduly; and one of these, *Cordelia's*, which suffers the most, we can least afford to have belittled. It is so vitally connected with the reasonableness of the play's general plan of action, and so singularly beautiful in itself, that we ought not to lose sight of it, even temporarily; certainly not without becoming conscious of the price we paid for its occultation in the glorious glamour which Salvini's power lends *Lear*.

Of genius we are most exacting. We secretly believe it seems that it may accomplish the impossible. Certainly we ask the more of him who gives us much. We require an actor who has force enough to revivify the central figure of a great drama to passively act and impliedly reveal to us all that is grouped about that central figure. We expect him to show us in his own part the general character of all the others,—to create for our immediate sympathetic comprehension a personage acting and acted upon, in various proportionate degrees, by all the other personages and circumstances of the play.

This Salvini does in *Othello* how miraculously! In his grave dignity when called before the Senate, we could see, without the intervention of any other actors or accessories, the whole imposing splendor and potency of the state of Venice. In his proud gratitude and in the tender love-light of his eyes when *Desdemona* declared her wifely devotion, we could feel, without the help of any masquerading lay-figure of an actress, the gracious womanly presence of "the gentle lady married to the Moor." Through all the pitiable struggles of his noble soul and in the bitter climax of its tigerish jealousy of love and honor, we could know well enough, without the aid of any insuffi-

cient heavy villain in the piece, what a lying demonic spirit was snaring the hero in its subtle meshes.

In *Othello*, Salvini mirrors in his one rôle all the other parts; but in *Lear*, though he is "every inch a king," he is not so compelling a magician. *Desdemona* is not hurt in the least by all our sympathy with Salvini's *Othello*; rather we see her through him in a kindlier light than that weak-minded fib she told about the handkerchief will bear us out in when we read by the book. But in Salvini's *Lear*, *Cordelia's* true-hearted nobleness and long-suffering love we miss somewhat the sense of in our over-wrought sympathy with the royal father. In that first scene where the king calls his daughters into the lists of the open court and baits them on with husbands and kingdoms for the prizes to a strange tongue-match of suborned love, the dignity and fondness of the royal father as Salvini acts it, draws our attention too much aside from the petulance and unreason which also characterizes Shakespeare's *Lear*, beside and in spite of this same admirable dignity and fondness. In consequence, *Cordelia's* part loses much of the consistency of its revolt against lip-service and all of its attractive loveliness.

Can it be, perhaps, that Salvini himself has not so thorough a liking for *Cordelia's* reserved and self-respecting character as he has for *Desdemona's* more yielding and less-upright nature? It would not be strange if this were true, and it would help to account for the greater satisfaction we find in Salvini's *Othello*, and also for that revulsion from *Cordelia* and her cool sincerity, which in our kindling enthusiasm for Salvini we feel at once in his interpretation of the first scene of *Lear*.

It is evident that the author of a recent magazine article\* has felt this and felt it strongly, even so far as to the confusion of her sober memory of Shakespeare. This author, in describing Salvini's characterization of *Lear*, says:

"His own nature is exuberantly and demonstratively affectionate, and in presence of his whole court he asks his daughters who among them loves him best, simply for the delight of hearing their filial and graceful replies. From *Regan* and *Goneril* he

\* Salvini's *Lear* in the *Century* for May.

receives dutiful responses; then overflowing with paternal pride and love he turns to his darling and youngest child, the gentlest and meekest of the three, and receives a rebuff, discourteous and irreverent enough to affront even a modern and non-royal father: 'I love you according to my bond, neither more nor less, I am not yet married, but the first stranger who appears and claims me as his wife will obtain from me a greater meed of affection than you can possibly expect.'"

Did Shakespeare's *Cordelia* indeed reply thus? Surely this strange paraphrase of her answer reminds us rudely of the few first words of "the unprized, precious maid."

Let us get this speech of *Cordelia's* at first hand again. Let us speak the speech as Shakespeare pronounced it to us, a few sentences weightied with the internal sense and quick revelation of *Cordelia's* real character. In a thousand editions of *de luxe* or *de pauvre*, the words must shine with the same wholesome sincerity. *Lear's* first demand is a challenge to *Cordelia's* unbribed love;

\* \* \* "Now our joy,

Altho' our last, not least, to whose young love

The vines of France and milk of Burgundy  
Strive to be interested, *what can you say to draw*

*A third more opulent than your sisters?'"*

This palpable bribe *Cordelia* disdains. To this, according to Shakespeare, and not to the question, "who among his daughters loves him best," she answers:

"Nothing, my Lord."

Earlier, when *Regan* and *Goneril* pile up before the gaping court the wordy affirmation of their love, Shakespeare gives *Cordelia* two significant asides. While *Goneril* is carefully telling the assembly how much her love makes her "breath poor and speech unable,"—*Cordelia* asks herself, "What shall *Cordelia* speak?"—and determines to "love, and be silent," and when *Regan* declares that she is made "of that self metal" as her sister, and professes herself "an enemy to all other joys" but her father's love, *Cordelia* exclaims again,—

"Then poor *Cordelia*!—

And yet not so, since I am sure my love's  
More ponderous than my tongue."

We are left in no doubt as to what she thinks of her sisters' time-serving baseness. They do not in the least deceive her. A little later in this same scene she tells them,—"I know you what you are." Throughout this whole first scene it is a fine inspir-

ing thing to see in how few natural, pithy words Shakespeare makes clear to us in just what temper of righteous indignation against her sisters' extravagant deceit and provoked disdain of submitting her own purer love to so sordid a test, *Cordelia* answers to the question,—

\* \* "What can you say to draw

A third more opulent than your sisters?'"

"Nothing, my Lord."

With obstinate uncompromising honor she persists in this reply. Then *Lear* makes another appeal to selfish interests to prove that disinterested love which he craved blindly, no doubt, but, certainly in his first undisciplined state, valued very inadequately.

"Nothing will come of nothing,"—he reminds her,—“speak again.”

"Unhappy, that I am,"—protests *Cordelia*,—"I cannot heave my heart into my mouth. I love your majesty according to my bond; no more, nor less."

"How! how! *Cordelia*. Mend your speech a little." (Why?) "Lest it may mar your fortunes."

One could not blame *Cordelia*, now, if some inherited ready anger and arrogance should prompt her reply. We find, however, that hers is one of those rare purely-truthful natures whose yea is yea, and nay nay, who love measure and follow honesty at the expense of policy.

"Good my lord,—you have begot me, bred me, loved me; I

Return those duties back, as are right fit,  
Obey you, love you, and most honor you."

These words weighed are strong enough, and *Cordelia* weighs hers, but they will not satisfy *Lear*. They are not prodigal enough. *Cordelia* also remembered *Regan's* extravagant and sweeping professions that she is an "enemy to all other joys," and "alone felicitate" in the king's love, and puts this shrewd question:—

"Why have my sisters' husbands if they say

They love you all?'"

And continues stoutly,—

"Haply when I shall wed

That lord whose hand must take my plight  
shall carry

Half my love with him, half my care and duty.

Sure I shall not marry like my sisters,

To love my father all."

We can see how this refreshing moderation and uncompromising honesty makes the exacting *Lear* furious, but we cannot see how

it can justify the paraphrase of this speech quoted above.

After this, *Lear* says :

"But goes thy heart with this?"

*Cordelia*. 'Ay, my good lord.

*Lear*. 'So young and so untender?"

"So young, my lord, and true," protests *Cordelia*; she will not accept the saying that she is untender, and she insists on being true.

"Let it be so," cries *Lear* :

—"thy truth then be thy dower!"

and thereupon he curses, casts off and dishonors her,—so far as he can dishonor her, her truth is still her dower. This dower she insists on afterward when she desires the king to make known to France that it is

"No unchaste action or dishonored step, That hath deprived me of your grace and favor,

But even for want of that for which I'm richer,

A still soliciting eye, and such a tongue, That I am glad I have it not, tho' not to have it

Hath lost me in your liking."

*Cordelia* is no patient *Griselda*. She has a saving self-respect that asserts itself again with a touch of captivating humor when *Burgundy* gives her his regrets that she must lose him for a husband.

"Peace be with *Burgundy*,"—says *Cordelia*—

"Since that respects of fortune are his love I shall not be his wife."

As for us, we will do well, like France, to find *Cordelia* "most rich, being poor, most choice, forsaken," and be grateful to this "unprized precious" martyr for truth's sake to those false gods, the loaves and fishes, which make bond-slaves enough of most of us.

A character like *Cordelia's* is rare in Shakespeare, and rare enough in life. The more's the pity that when its main lines are so finely and firmly indicated as in this wonderful play of King *Lear*, we should not get at once an inspiring glimpse of its spiritual beauty and understand the firm and vital fiber of its relation to the moral motive and momentum of the play.

The author before quoted, speaking of this first scene of *Lear*, says :

"Whoever transports himself mentally into the period, place and circumstances, will not consider the wrath of *Lear* exaggerated. Only because of our own difficulty in laying aside the knowledge of *Cordelia's* true character which the later portions of the play reveal, do we here sympathize with her, and condemn the perfectly justifiable indignation of the aggrieved parent and monarch."

Salvini may give us warrant for a view like this; does Shakespeare? If it is assumed that in this first act we get no indication of what manner of woman this is, then we are authorized in condemning *Cordelia* and sympathizing thoroughly "with the perfectly justifiable indignation of the aggrieved parent and monarch"; then Salvini is right in giving us so commanding a representation of royalty and fatherhood that we lose all sight of *Lear's* defects and the unreasonable and petty nature of his exactions, and witness with a just aversion the revolt of *Cordelia's* self-respecting integrity and self-honoring love. Surely if *Cordelia's* real character is only revealed in the last act, a surprise to everybody, then it is a very inconsistent character in itself and in its relation to *Lear*, and we have caught Shakespeare nodding in its portrayal. This may not be impossible. Is it true? Is *Cordelia's* real character only revealed in the later portions of the play? Take the book,—Shakespeare, like *Cordelia*, means his words,—and see whether the dozen or two lines he gives *Cordelia* mean nothing in particular, or whether they do not mean to embody the expression of a quiet, womanly, true-hearted, self-respecting soul : one which promises to be not easily hoodwinked, to repay the truest loving, and to be depended upon if need be in the evil day that this first scene of the play forebodes.

Salvini has received so much amply-merited praise for his interpretations of Shakespeare that we may excuse ourselves from any ungraciousness in looking for a sun-spot or two. If any of us who gratefully acknowledge his genius should discover on *Cordelia's* side of the account any foreign grain in the delicate balance of his King *Lear*, it may be assumed that it is not because we love Salvini less but that we love Shakespeare more.

Charlotte Porter

## ON THE "IMBARRING" OF "CROOKED TITLES."

THE word "imbar" as it stands in *Canterbury's* speech on the Salic law, in the first Act of Henry V., has long been a noteworthy Shakespearian *crux*. The whole passage, according to the Cambridge Editors' text, is necessary to an examination of the word, and runs thus:

*Cant.*

\* \* \*

So that, as clear as is the summer's sun,  
King Pepin's title and Hugh Capet's claim,  
King Lewis his satisfaction, all appear  
To hold in right and title of the female:  
So do the kings of France unto this day;  
Howbeit they would hold up this Salique law  
To bar your highness claiming from the female,  
And rather choose to hide them in a net  
Than amply to imbar their crooked titles  
Usurp'd from you and your progenitors.

[HEN. V, I, ii. 86-95.]

"Imbar" has the authority (not lightly to be set aside by conservative criticism) of the four Folios. In the first and second it stands "imbarre," in the others "imbar." The earliest Quartos, however, read, "imbase," to which I believe no satisfactory or conjectural significance has been attached—the later quartos read "embrace." The Quartos also substitute "*causes*" for "titles," possibly to avoid the repetition of the latter word from the second line of the extract cited.

The earliest critical editor, Rowe, changed the word to *make bare* in his first edition, but afterwards repented of his rashness and adhered to the Folio. Theobald, following Warburton, printed *imbare*, explained as laying open, making naked, exposing to view, a reading adopted by Dyce, "for want of a better" as he candidly says. Knight reverted to the Folio reading "imbar," giving it the meaning of 'bar in, secure.' Schmidt, who accepts the folio form, explains it as meaning 'to exclude,' and Hudson, reasoning in the same channel, attaches to it the meaning of 'to set aside.' The exegesis of Schmidt and Hudson seems untenable, for it would make *Canterbury* say in effect: 'The kings of France to this day hide themselves in a net of sophistry and subterfuge rather than openly (amply) exclude or set aside their own false titles.' "This," says W. A. Wright, "it would be too much to expect any claimant to do."

H. H. Vaughan, in his *New Readings*,

gives and defends the disputed line as it stands in the later Quartos:

"Than amply to embrace their crooked causes."

Subsequently, however, in *Notes and Queries*, 6 series, V. 243, for April 1, 1882, he quotes "a passage in Holinshed which has no reference to the reign of Henry V., but which Shakespeare probably had read,— 'So when he was possessed and not interested in the same, he *uncased* the *crooked* conditions which he had covertly *concealed*, and in the end as by the sequele you shall see did pull shame and infamy upon himself.'" (Holinshed, Book V., ch. i., p. 553.) In view of this Vaughan suggests:—

"Than amply to *uncase* their crooked causes,"

and argues that the "imbase" of the Quartos is a probable misprint for *uncase*, which he further takes to be a then common orthographical form of *uncase*.

The latest critic, Kinnebar, in his readable *Cruces Shakespearianæ*, advocates *unbar*, following an unadopted suggestion of Steevens, and fortifies it by quoting from *Cymbeline*, V., iv. 8:—

"By the sure physician, death, who is the key  
To unbar these locks"—

which he compares with Hen. V, I, i. 86.

"The severals and *unhidden* passages  
Of his *true titles*,"

and gives to "unbar" the same sense as to *unhide*, i. e., to *discover*, to *lay open*.

When the context is carefully considered, it is, I think, reasonably evident that some meaning like Rowe's *make bare*, or Steevens' *unbar* as explained by Kinnebar, is needful to make sense with "amply"—a word which W. N. Lettsom somewhat petulantly pronounced to be "as sheer nonsepe as '*imbarre*.'" W. A. Wright saw this clearly when he wrote: "The previous line appears to give the clue to the real explanation. The kings of France, says the Archbishop, whose own right is derived only through the female line, prefer to shelter themselves under the flimsy protection of an appeal to the Salic law, which would exclude Henry's claim, instead of fully securing and defend-

ing their own titles by maintaining that, though, like Henry's, derived through the female line, their claim was stronger than his."

It has seemed somewhat strange to me that among all who have commented upon this passage, no one, so far as I know, has seen in the disputed phrase another illustration of Shakespeare's fondness for employing the language of heraldry on all pertinent occasions. The word "imbar" is not extant as a legitimate heraldic term, but constructively it is as regular as *impale*, and in an age when the written English language was fluctuating, Shakespeare may readily have coined it to express the idea of setting a *bar* upon the arms of France to conventionally express the nature and descent of a title. To a mind so keenly alive to the minute shades of meaning of phrases, the verb as clearly indicated the heraldic process and its result as *impale* denoted the division of an escutcheon *per pale*, that is, by a straight line down the middle.

The bar is one of the mystic heraldic "charges" known as "ordinaries," always to be bounded by straight lines. It passes horizontally across the middle of the shield, and occupies about one-fifth of its surface. In ancient times, when the shield was actually borne by the knight as a bodily defense, the bar was probably a band of metal or colored wood (according as the shield itself were of colored material or metal) fastened to its surface, to denote some later title of descent than that expressed by the original ground of the shield. The significance of these superimposed "charges" is well shown

by the best known of them, the *bend sinister*, which is a band passing diagonally across the shield from left to right, and means that its holder is an illegitimate scion of the knightly house whose shield he carries.

Remembering that the *bar* must be bounded by *straight* lines, the antithesis implied by the use of the epithet "crooked" to qualify the usurping titles of the reigning kings of France becomes evident. Their titles were inherently *crooked*, they could not be made *straight*, and used as a bar to conform to the requirement of the College of Arms, and to set them amply—that is, in the sight of all—bar-wise upon the escutcheon of France would have been to expose their falsity and manifest violation of one of the first canons of heraldry. Shakespeare's meaning seems to have been that the usurping kings of France, instead of boldly, or openly, attempting to make their incurably crooked title through the female descent straight, and placing it prominently on the royal arms as a heraldic bar to denote that their claim was stronger than Henry's, chose rather to take refuge behind a net or web of sophistry and deny that he had any title at all.

The qualifying adverb, "*amply*," supports the heraldic interpretation of the disputed line. Shakespeare uses it elsewhere as meaning "evidently, openly, in the sight of all men":—

"*Val.* The element itself, till seven years' heat,  
Shall not behold her face at *ample* view;  
But, like a cloistress, she will veiled walk"—

(TWELFTH NIGHT, I, i, 27.)

Alvay A. Alder

# HAMLET'S "DRAM OF EALE" AND WHAT IT "DOTH."

[Reprinted by permission from the "Proceedings of the American Philological Association for 1883." The spelling is a little unconventional, being improved in some particulars according to the rules jointly recommended and adopted by the American Philological Association and the English Philological Society.]

CONSIDER the hole passage, "This heavy-headed-revel, east and west," etc., Ham. I., iv., 17-38. It is diffuse, involvd, anacoluthic, repetitious, superfluous, detach't, unfinisht; but to a careful reader it is all clear enuf except the last three lines:

the dram of eale  
Doth all the noble substance of a doubt  
To his own scandal.

I. First catch your hare; first find your infinitiv. Begin then at the end. *To his own scandal* is plainly right. *Doth all the noble substance* is plainly right. The metrical and statistical tests leav no room for uncertainty. *Scandal* occurs 14 times in Shakespeare's plays (see the industrious Clarke); *substance* is a favorit word, occurring 39 times; *noble* is very frequent, and the collocation *noble substance* is quite Shakespearian. The infinitiv is evidently conceal'd by *of a doubt*. Then *of* is wrong. It must be *oft*. (1) The qualification *oft* is required. The statement evidently intended is not tru always. It is tru often. (2) *Oft* is uz'd abuv ("so, oft it chanc'es in particular men," etc.), in a statement of which the lines in dispute ar a summarized repetition. (3) *Oft* and not *often*. *Oft* is the old word. *Often* is modern, was then new, and was much less common than *oft*, even in prose.

What, now, is the infinitiv disguised by *a doubt*? The gesses hav been more numerous than happy.

1. Hardly *doubt*, "in the sense of throwing doubt or distrust upon." Where do you get this sense? It does not seem to hav the least support.

2. Hardly *dout*, "to destroy." *Dout* has not that sense, that sense is wrong for this passage, and *dout* is a rare word. It appears in only two other passages in Shakespeare, both uncertain:

I have a speech of fire that fain would blaze,  
But that this folly [his tears] *douts* it.  
Ham. IV., vii., 191-2.

So the folio. The quartos have *drowns*.

Con. Hark, how our steeds for present service neigh!  
Dau. Mount them, and make incision in their hides,  
That their hot blood may spin in English eyes,  
And *dout* them with superfluous courage, ha!  
Vol. I.—3.

Ram. What, will you have them weep our horse blood?

How shall we, then, behold their natural tears?

Hen. V., IV., ii., 8-13.

So Collier, Knight and others. The original has *doubt*; but *dout* is probably right here, and in the preceding instance, where *drowns* is a natural substitute for the less familiar *douts*. The sense in both passages is "to put out, to extinguish," as a light or a fire. This is the only sense *dout* can be proved to hav had. Note the conection with *tears* in both these passages. It is clear that *Hamlet* does not regard "the noble substance" as a light or a fire to be put out.

3. *Abate* (Hudson) is an unsupported gess, and the sense assigned, "cast down or depress," is quite unsuitable here.

4. *Attaint* and *debase* (the latter a conjecture of Dyce) cum nearer to the sense intended, but can not be accepted. Other gesses may be past by.

5. How would *corrupt* do? I do not know that it has been suggested before. It conveys exactly the right sense and meets the conditions fairly well. The possibility of mistaking a badly written *corrupt* (we may postulate bad penmanship, if we like) for *a doubt*, or of getting the types for *corrupt* mixt so as to result in *a doubt*, is at least not remote, considering that the copyist or printer was working in a hazy atmosphere, as I hav hinted at the beginning of this paper. *Corrupt* is a favorit word of Shakespeare's. It occurs 18 times in verse (3 times at the end of the line) and 7 times in prose; *corrupted* occurs 18 times, *corrupter*, noun, 2 times, adj., compar., once, *corrupting*, 2 times, *corruptly*, *corruptible*, *corruptibly*, each once, *corruption*, 17 times. *Corrupt* occurs in conection with *nature* twice (All's Well, III., ii., 90; 3 Hen. IV., III., ii., 155), with *taint* or *tainted* 5 times (Merry Wives, V. v., 94, *bis*; Mer. of Ven., III., ii., 75; 1 Hen. VI., V. iv., 45, Oth. I., iii., 272), with *vicious* once (Hen. VIII., I., ii., 116), with *manners* once (Rich. III., IV., iv., 236). Note, now, the occurrence of the same or of similar terms in this *Hamlet* passage: *vicious mole of nature, defect, fault, corruption, nature, complexion, manners*.

A serious objection to asuming *corrupt*

in this line, is the occurrence of *corruption* in the second line above. But, considering again the iterative and unfinished character of the whole passage, and the fact that the last lines are thrown in as a condensed restatement of what precedes, the objection loses sum of its force. On the whole, until a better guess shall be made, we may assume *corrupt* to be the word intended.

The result is not felicitous, it must be admitted. Shakespeare, who could so easily be felicitous, has neglected to be felicitous here, and must suffer the consequences.

II. The thing which thus "corrupts the noble substance" of a man's reputation and character (both are concerned), and brings it into "scandal," is "the dram of eale." *Dram* is no doubt right. Its use in the sense here to be understood, "a small amount, a little," is well established in Shakespeare. *Eale* is something bad. The quarto of 1611 and the undated quarto have "eafe," the 1604 quarto, "eale," which is believed to be right as against "eafe."

1. The reading "eafe" suggested Theobald's emendation "base." His note is amusing, and worth quoting: "I do not remember a Passage throughout all our Poet's works more intricate and depraved in the Text, of less meaning to outward appearance, or more likely to baffle the attempts of criticism in its aid. It is certain there is neither Sense nor Grammar as it now stands: yet with a slight alteration, I'll endeavour to cure those Defects and give a Sentiment, too, that shall make the Poet's Thought close nobly." (Shak. ed. Theobald, vol. 8, p. 124, Lond. 1752). In this laudable "endeavour" he puts "Base" for what he quotes as "Eafe," and "Worth out" for "a doubt." He says: "The Dram of *Base* (as I have corrected the Text) means the least alloy of Baseness or Vice. It is very frequent with our Poet to use the *Adjective* of *Quality* instead of the *Substantive* signifying the thing. Besides, I have observed that elsewhere, speaking of *Worth* he delights to consider it as a *Quality* that adds *Weight* to a Person, and connects the Word with that Idea." (*Id. ib.*)

But this alleged use of the adjective of quality for the substantive without the definite article preceding, is not at all frequent. Besides, *base* has not the shade of meaning here required. In the sense of "degraded, low, mean, ordinary," it occurs 135 times in the plays, not once as a substantive equivalent to *baseness*. *Baseness* occurs 18 times.

2. *Vile* will not do as a substitute for *eale*. The reasons against *base* are equally strong against *vile*. The latter occurs 110 times as an adjective, not once as a substantive.

3. *Bale* is simply absurd.

4. *Ill* is plausible. But an examination shows that *ill*, as a noun, occurs almost invariably in the sense of "harm, harmful deed or event, misfortune" (so 33 times); only once in a sense similar to that here intended, and in that instance *ill* may equally well be called an adjective: "A mingled yarn, good and ill together." (All's Well, IV. iii., 72.)

As an adverb *ill* is found 69 times, in compounds 43 times more; as an adjective, in a general sense, 102 times, in the sense of "sick" 13 times, in a compound once. It is not easy, considering the frequency of the word, to see how it could be corrupted to *eale*.

5. I believe the right word is *evil*. *Evil*, in the exact sense here required, namely, a moral taint, a "vicious mole of nature," is common in Shakespeare, and everywhere. In this and other shades of meaning the noun occurs 61 times in the plays, 22 times at the end of a verse, as in the line in question. As an adjective *evil* is found 21 times, as an adverb twice. But how came *evil* to be printed *eale*? The meter allows a final atonic syllable, but only, or usually, before a natural pause. There is no natural pause here, and so the atonic syllable may have been suppressed by contraction, leaving an accented monosyllable at the end, as required. That is, *evil* (or rather *euil*, as then spelt), pronounced *évil* (é as in *they*), was contracted to *él*, spelt phonetically (but with the already conventional 'silent' final *e*) *eale*; *ea* being then the recognized digraph for the *é* sound, which digraph still survives with that sound in *break, great, yea*, in the 'Irish' pronunciation of *speak, eat, meat, please, reason*, etc., and, with slight modifications since developed, in the modern *bear, tear, wear, head, dead, stead, bread, pleasant*, etc.

This pronunciation of *ea* gives the point to *Falstaff's* pun, which most readers fail to appreciate: "If reasons (pronounced *rêznz*, as if 'raisins,' cf. M. E. spelling *reisins*, Alisaunder 5193; also *raisins*, as now) were as plenty as blackberries, I would give no man a reason upon compulsion." 1 Hen. IV., II. iv.)

This contraction of *evil* (*euil, eucl, eule*) to *eale* is paralleled by the very common contractions of *ever* (*euer*) to *e'er*, often spelt *ere* in Shakespeare (compare *or ever*, developed from *or ere*, supposed to be for *or e'er*), *never* (*neuer*) to *ne'er*, often spelt *ner*, *even* (*euen*) to *e'en*, often spelt *ene* (so *good even* contracts to *good den* and *godden*). So *devil* (*deuil, deucl*) contracts to Middle-English *del*, (an occasional form), Scottish *deil, deel*, provincial English *deel, decle, dewle* and *dule*. The Devil is simply invaluable to dramatists.

The word occurs 280 times in Shakespeare's plays, 123 times in prose and 157 times in verse. The meter often requires it to be a monosyllable, but I have not taken the trouble to examine all the instances in the original editions to find out whether it is ever printed as an obvious monosyllable. Such contractions, however, occur much earlier than Shakespeare's time:

(1) In *Instructions for Parish Priests* by John Myrc, written about A. D. 1400 (ed. Edw. Peacock, Lond., 1868) *del* and *el* rhyme (lines 360-365):

Wychehafte and telynge,  
Forbede thou hem for any thyng;  
For whoso be-leueth in the fay  
Mote be-leue thus by any way,  
That hyt ys a sleghthe of the *del*,  
That maketh a body to cache *el*.

The editor notes: "*del* or *de(ue)l*; *el* or *e(ue)l*."

(2) In *Specimens of Lyric Poetry* (ed. T. Wright, Lond., 1842) *del* again occurs (p. 111.):

The *del* hym to-drawe.

(3) In Halliwell's *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words* (ninth ed., Lond. 1878) appears the entry:

*Eile*, Evil. Nominale MS.

(4) In the *Ancien Rioule*, written about A. D. 1200 (ed. J. Morton, Lond. 1853) occurs a word spelt variously *eile*, *eil*, *el*:

The blake deth lesse *eile* to then *eien* (p. 50).  
Mid gode riht muwen eithurles beon jhoten *eil*.  
thurles, vor heo habbeth idon muchel *eil* to moni on ancre (p. 62).

Professor F. A. March, remarking upon this paper, said he had been accustomed to think that the errors in this passage were from misreading rather than mishearing. The main mistake in *eale* was reading *a* for *u*, which was of course Shakespeare's way of writing the *v* of the *evil*; *eule* is one of the spellings of *evil* in early English (see Morris's *Specimens*, Vol. I, s. v.) and Shakespeare may have written it here; but whether he wrote *eule*, *euel*, *euil*, the *ductus literarum* is easy—for a printer who has a *dram* of *ale* in his head. Reading *a* for *u* probably occurs also in Julius Caesar, II., i., 83:

"For if thou path thy native semblance on."

*Path* for *putte*.

The great trouble in the passage has been with *of a doubt*. The meaning is, however, fairly certain. It must be, as Prof. Scott says, "The little evil corrupts the whole substance," and probably by pervading, "o'er-

Theo thet on eni *uuel* doth (var. *eil*; p. 186).  
*Uuele* ihrowed (var. *el*; p. 368).

But may not *eile*, *eil*, *el*, in these passages be the M. E. substantiv in the sense of pain, harm, associated with M. E. *eile*, *eil*, painful, trouble, from A. S. *egle*, cognate with Gothic *aglus*, *δυσκολος*? It may be. Note, however, that this alleged M. E. substantiv occurs only in these passages, if it occurs anywhere, and that there is no corresponding A. S. substantiv *eglu* associated with *egle*, tho there is a Gothic substantiv *aglo*, trouble, *ἀγλός*. Note, also, that in two of the passages from the *Ancien Rioule* *eil* or *el* actually occurs as a variant of *uuel* (= *euel*), in one of the two (p. 368) as an *adverb*. There is no M. E. or A. S. adverb associated with *eile* or *egle*, trouble. (The verb is very common: A. S. *eglian*, M. E. *eilen*, E. *aíl*.) Still, the loss of *u* (-*v*), between two vowels is so rare at this early period that while one may consider *eil*, *eile*, in the passages cited, or in sum of them, to be the same word as *euel*, the influence of the other *eile*, *eil*, trouble, upon the *form* must be admitted. Finally, we are not to ignore the influence of M. E. *ille* (E. *ill*), from Icel. *illr*, earlier *illr*, Swed. *illa*, *ill*, Dan. *ilde*, originally identical with *euel*.

Whether the view here set forth as to the reason why *euel*, (*euil*, *evil*) appears as *eale*, can be sustained or not, I have no doubt that *evil* is the word intended. The lines in dispute, as thus emended, are not particularly brilliant or original; but they will do. They have caused more controversy than they are worth *per se*. But they are not *per se*. They are a part of *Hamlet*.

Charles P. Scott.

leavening" it. But Shakespeare uses *subdue* in this sense:

My nature is *subdu'd*  
To what it works in, like the dyer's hand.  
Sonn. cxi.

His face *subdu'd*  
To penetrative shame;  
Ant. and Cleo., IV., xiv., 74.

My heart's *subdu'd*  
Euen to the very quality of my lord;  
Oth. I., iii., 251.

Read then  
"The dram of evil  
Doth all the noble substance oft *subdue*  
To his own scandal."

And you have a striking Shakespearean figure, and a characteristic rhythmical repetition to boot. I had cherished this reading as my own—the Cambridge collators do not give it—but Mr. Furness has found it in *Chambers' Household Shakespeare*, to the editors of which it was suggested, it seems, by Mr. Swynfen Jervis.

## THE EXHUMATION.

THERE hardly appears to have been a time when the question of removing Shakespeare's remains was not agitated. Ben Jonson resented the idea in his commendatory lines prefixed to the first folio edition of the dramatic works published in 1623 when Mrs. Ann Shakespeare died, and Milton in his epitaph prefixed to the Second Folio—1632—questions the need

"That his hallowed reliques should be lied  
Under a stary-pointing pyramid."

If there ever was any serious purpose to remove them for deposit with the glorious dust gathered in Poet's Corner since the time of Richard the Second, who ordered the burial of Chaucer there, it does not appear to have taken any definite form, but it is entirely probable that Westminster Abbey, as the final resting place for the greatest poet, was familiar to the thoughts of the English people, Londoners, especially, always. That Shakespeare himself venerated the place we have abundant evidence by allusions to it in the scenes so vividly depicted by him of a royal funeral and a royal coronation; the one in "Henry the Sixth" and the other in "Henry the Eighth." Nothing is more probable than that the Abbey was a favorite place for pensive resort by the poet, and that he had it in mind when he wrote those grand lines in "The Tempest" which posterity transposed and inscribed upon his statue in Poet's Corner.

The modern impulse towards disturbing the dust of Shakespeare was imparted by Miss Delia Bacon, whose sad story is best told by Hawthorne in his *Recollections of a Gifted Woman* to be found in his charming volume *Our Old Home*. It appears that she was humored by the Stratfordians up to the point of actually making a breach in the tomb, but that either from fear, or having penetrated their mere disguise of sincerity in the matter, she desisted and left the place never to return.

Washington Irving's story about the old Sexton, Edmonds, in the *Sketch Book*, obtains no credence in Stratford, the custodians of Holy Trinity Church claiming that if such a breach had been made near enough to Shakespeare's tomb to permit a peep into it, some record of a burial or other displacement of the pavements necessary under the circumstances, would have been preserved.

Without discussing the merits of Dr. Ingleby's pamphlet written in advocacy of opening the tomb, it is supposed that the act would settle a great deal now held in doubt about the man Shakespeare. To one there is a great deal that is inexplicable about his interment. His name does not appear upon the grave-stone pointed out as his. There is no distinguishing inscription on it—nothing in fact but those guardian lines which are said to have protected the grave from violation up to the present time. Shakespeare died and was buried in 1616; his wife died and was buried in 1623, yet her gravestone takes prece-

dence in the row of grave-stones of the Shakespeare family and is placed next the wall immediately beneath his monument which is erected against a blank window on the left of the spectator as he faces the altar, and by its inscription challenges attention thus:

"Stay, Passenger; why goest thou by so fast?  
Read, if thou canst, whom envious death hath  
plast

Within this monument: Shakespeare, with whom  
Quick nature died; whose name doth deck this  
tomb,

Far more than cost; sith all that he has writ  
Leaves living art but page to serve his wit."

The inscription on Mrs. Ann Shakespeare's grave-stone is engraved on a small brass plate let into the stone. Next following the gravestones of Mrs. Ann Shakespeare and the poet are those of Thos. Nash, died 1647, John Hall, died 1635, and Susanna Hall, died 1649. On each of these stones, Shakespeare's excepted, the usual inscription appears, "Here lyeth the body" etc., and as they occupy most of the entire width of the chancel, and in fact constitute the upper first row of the flagging, it is unaccountable why the interments and inscriptions did not follow each other in chronological order. The rhyming part of Mrs. Susanna Hall's epitaph was at one time obliterated, and in its place was cut an inscription to the memory of one Richard Watts, but this in turn was erased and the original inscription restored.

A glance at Shakespeare's little monument is sufficient to dispel any idea of the literalness of its inscription, except indeed that the body of the poet was incinerated and the few handfuls of ashes deposited "within" the masonry, which is highly improbable, as cremation was unknown to the practice of that day in England. Embalment however was common enough, at least it was an art perfectly well known and successfully practiced. Dr. John Hall, Shakespeare's son-in-law benefited most of all the heirs by the poet's death, and he was a physician of skill and eminence. He was master of all the arts pertaining to his profession, as evidenced by his diary, which, however, posterity is not so grateful for as it would have been had he commenced it in 1615 instead of 1618, so as to include notes of the final illness and treatment of the illustrious father of his wife. In that case the diary of Dr. Hall might also have contained the formula of embalming "my son-in-law, Master William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon, gentleman." If Shakespeare was embalmed, there is every reason to believe that his bones and skull are as well preserved as Ben. Jonson's were found to be in 1849 when they were discovered standing bolt upright in the sand in Westminster Abbey. A second disturbance of Ben's grave in 1859, showed that the skull was still intact, with portions of his reddish-brown hair still sticking to it.

But no matter what the circumstances attendant upon Shakespeare's interment, no matter what the disbelief in his remains being under the old gravestone in Holy Trinity Church, no matter what the plea for removing it to compare his skull with the monumental bust and the accredited portraits, no human argument will convince the powerful majority nor prevail upon them that the sacred rest of two hundred and sixty-seven years shall be disturbed. The sentiment of Christendom is against all violations of the tomb, yet nothing is more common.

The mystery that shrouds the life of Shakespeare surrounds him even at his tomb, and there is no assurance whatever that by opening it and flooding its interior by the inquisitive light of the nineteenth century that a single scintillation could reach "the dark backward and abysm of time" when the poet walked among the sons of men, while their hearts burned within them as he talked to them by the way.

EDWARD BETTY,

Cincinnati, Ohio.

[In the early part of September a cable despatch from London informed the public that the custodian of Shakespeare's grave, the Rev. G. Arbuthnot, Vicar of Stratford-on-Avon, had given his consent to the exhumation of the poet's remains. The announcement was received with varied feelings, some approving but more condemning it. Among American Shakespearean scholars it was generally regarded as a "shocking desecration and a useless, ungrateful, hyperpractical sacrilege."

As the event shows, however, the announcement seems to have been premature and the many outbursts of popular indignation that followed it, "much ado about nothing." This will appear from a conversation which a correspondent of the *London Times* had with the Rev. G. Arbuthnot. The Vicar said that he had received a copy of Dr. Ingleby's work, *Shakespeare's Bones*, which was dedicated to him, and to the Mayor and Corporation of Stratford. In acknowledging its receipt, he told Dr. Ingleby that if public opinion were in favor of the poet's remains being disinterred, he should offer no opposition to the proposal, as he thought Dr. Ingleby had made out a good case in favor of an investigation. Something more than his acquiescence, however, would be necessary before anything could be done. He wished his position to be regarded as a neutral one. He had no desire to stand in the way of any scientific investigation, which the public might hold to be necessary.

Subsequently, to make assurance doubly sure, and to quiet the apprehensions that existed in literary circles, the Vicar addressed a letter to the *London Times*, stating the facts as given above.

Subsequently, on September 4th, the Town Council met to discuss the matter. Previous to this Mr. Halliwell-Phillips addressed the following memorial to the Mayor and Corporation:—

"Understanding that the subject of the proposed exhumation of Shakespeare may be discussed at the meeting of the Council on Tuesday next, I venture very respectfully but with equal earnestness to suggest reasons against the suggested disinterment. Whatever opinion may be formed respecting the authorship of the lines upon the stone, there can scarcely be a reasonable doubt that they are a record of the poet's own wishes. The lineal descent from him having long since terminated, there can never be the entail of a Blenheim or a Strathfieldsaye to indicate a nation's gratitude, and a deference to those wishes would seem to be the only possible manner in which that gratitude can now be expressed. Neither would the exhumation serve the purpose intended by its projector, our respected colleague, Dr. Ingleby. If a skull were found in the grave and its formation corresponded with the monumental bust, there would merely be a confirmation of our present knowledge. If, on the contrary, the formation did not so correspond, the inference would naturally be that it was not Shakespeare's, the evidence of the bust altogether outweighing that of a particular skull found in the grave. It must be recollected that we are almost destitute of information as to the extent to which the series of graves in the chancel have been tampered with during the 267 years which have now elapsed, it being only by the merest accident that we know for certain that one of the Shakespearean tombs was disturbed in the last century for the interment of a stranger. There is, however, a very interesting question which might be easily determined without disregard or rather with a regard to the poet's last wishes. The slab which now covers his grave is a new one, belonging to the present century, but it is believed that the original stone was left under the present one. The restoration of the former, in however decayed a state, to the view of the public, could hardly fail to meet with universal approval."

At the meeting of the Council on September 4th, the matter was discussed and definitely, we believe, decided. The Mayor was the first speaker. He said that telegrams and letters had flowed in upon him from every quarter of the world protesting against the proposed disinterment. He would disabuse the public mind of any impression that this sacrilege would be attempted. He and the Councilmen of Stratford would never consent to the exhumation being made. If necessary, the citizens of Stratford would band together to guard the sanctity of the poet's tomb and they would not hesitate to cool the sacrilegious ardor of any exhumationist in the quiet river that flows so close to his grave. (Hear, hear.)

After other speeches of a like character and to the same effect were made, the Council decided unanimously to offer strenuous opposition to any attempt to disturb the remains of their great townsman.—ED.]

## JOHN PAYNE COLLIER.

THE venerable John Payne Collier whose life has been co-existent with the art of literary criticism itself, died on Tuesday, September 18, at the great age of 94 years. He was born in London on the 11th of January, 1789. At the age of 20 he was entered a student of the Middle Temple, but his love for literature was stronger than the fascinations of the legal profession. For a time he acted as Parliamentary Reporter of the *Morning Chronicle*, and was a contributor to the *Edinburgh Magazine*, *Literary Review*, and other papers. His first work cast in permanent literary form was *The Poetical Decameron or Ten Conversations on English Poets and Poetry, Particularly of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James*, 1820, 2 vol. r. 8vo. This effort met with the hearty commendation of Hallam. *The Poet's Pilgrimage*, a poem composed at an early date was published in 1822 and in 1825-27 Collier re-edited *Dodsley's Old Plays*, introducing 6 new dramas, and in 1828 added a supplementary volume, containing five plays of the Elizabethan period.

His first authoritative work was the *History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration*, 1831, 3rd. 8vo. He next compiled a *Bibliographical and Critical Catalogue to Lord Ellesmere's collection of rare English Books*, privately printed.

Collier's researches in Lord Ellesmere's library gave him the material for *New Facts regarding the Life of Shakespeare*, 1835. The same year he published *New Particulars*, and in 1839, *Further Particulars*. In 1842-44 appeared his valuable 8vol. ed. of the *Works of Shakespeare, with the various Readings, Notes, a Life of the Poet and a History of the Early English Stage*.

In 1848 he published a most invaluable work entitled *Shakespeare's Library, a Collection of the Ancient Romances, Novels, Legends, Poems, and Histories used by Shakespeare as the foundation of His Dramas, now First Collected and Accurately Reprinted from the Original Editions*.

The later works of Mr. Collier, excepting the books brought forth by the "Controversy," were an edition of Shakespeare in 8 vol. (concluded in 1878) and a new edition of his *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, 3 vol. 1879. At the end of this work he reprinted his *Memoirs of the Principal Actors in Shakespeare's Plays when Originally Performed*, which was first published by the old Shakespeare Society.

Mr. Collier was for a long time Director of the Shakespeare Society, and edited for it and the Camden Society a number of works. In 1850 he was made Vice-President of the Society of Antiquaries. In consequence of his valuable assistance in cataloguing the treasures of the British Museum and for other services, he received an annual pension of £100 from the government.

In 1849 Mr. Collier bought of Thomas Rodd a copy of the second folio, (1632) the margins of which were filled with thousands of notes and emendations, apparently written in the 17th century by one familiar with the correct text of the plays. The editors and critics of the day, who had been quarreling over their few conjectures were by no means disposed to accept this mass of emendations as genuine, and thereupon ensued the famous "Collier controversy," the most bitter of Shakespearian disputes.

[The following bibliographical sketch of the "controversy" has been kindly furnished by Mr. J. Parker Norris, for many years a warm personal friend of Mr. Collier.]

What is known as the "Collier Controversy" called forth a perfect avalanche of pamphlets, books, and newspaper and magazine articles.

In 1852 Mr. Collier published his *Notes and Emendations to the text of Shakespeare's Plays*. This first edition was followed by a second in 1853. In these editions Mr. Collier gave a history of the finding of the corrected Folio of 1632, and many of the emendations contained in it.

Mr. Collier also printed for private circulation some additional facsimiles of the emendations, which have become extremely rare, owing to the small number issued.

The same year that the first edition was published Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps issued a brochure entitled *A few remarks on the Emendation "who smothers her with painting,"* 8vo., London: 1852.

The next year Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps brought out *Curiosities of Modern Shakespeare criticism*. 8vo. London: 1853.

The same year Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps issued another pamphlet entitled *Observations on some of the manuscript Emendations of the text of Shakespeare, and are they copyright?* 8vo., London: 1853.

Mr. Samuel Weller Singer, who has edited two editions of Shakespeare, now published a violent volume against the emendations, which he called *The Text of Shakespeare Vindicated from the interpolations and corruptions advocated by John Payne Collier, Esq., in his Notes and Emendations*, 8vo. London: 1853.

Again the indefatigable Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps entered the field of controversy with another pamphlet—*Observations on the Shakespearian Forgeries at Bridgewater House,* etc., 8vo., London: 1853. This was printed for private circulation.

Mr. Alexander Dyce, a most learned and acute critic, and for a long time the friend of Mr. Collier, but who had now become his enemy, published a volume called *A few Notes on Shakespeare; with occasional remarks on the emendations of the manuscript corrector in Mr. Collier's copy of the folio*, 1862. 8vo., London: 1853.

The same year Mr. Joseph Hunter published a little book with a very long title—*A few Words in reply to the Animadversions of the Rev. Mr. Dyce on Mr. Hunter's "Disquisition on the Tempest,"* (1839); and his *"New Illustrations of the Life, Studies and Writings of Shakespeare"* (1845); contained in his work entitled *"A Few Notes, etc., etc."* By the author of the *Disquisition and Illustrations.* 8vo., London: 1853.

Mr. Charles Knight now appeared with a pamphlet—*Old Lamps or New? A Plea for the original Editions of the Text of Shakespeare,* etc. 16mo. London: 1853.

In 1853 Mr. Collier also published an edition of the plays of Shakespeare, in one volume quarto, containing the emendations embodied in the text.

Mr. Richard Grant White's *Shakespeare Scholar*, 8vo., New York: 1854, noticed and commented on many of the emendations.

In 1855 Mr. E. A. Brae published anonymously a pamphlet entitled *Literary Cookery with reference to matter attributed to Coleridge and Shakespeare,* etc., 8vo. London: 1855. Mr. Brae first sent the MS. of this pamphlet, in the form of a letter, to the London *Athenaeum*, and that journal refused to print it. Mr. Collier subsequently commenced an action for libel against the publisher of the pamphlet, but the action failed.

The subsequent year Mr. Collier published *Seven Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton by the late S. T. Coleridge,* etc. 8vo. London: 1856. This work also contained a list of all the MS. emendations in Mr. Collier's corrected 1632 folio.

In 1858 Mr. Collier published a new edition of the works of Shakespeare, in six volumes, containing the emendations.

The next year Dr. C. M. Ingleby published *The Shakespeare Fabrications,* etc. 16mo., London: 1859, and in 1860 Mr. N. E. S. A. Hamilton issued his *Inquiry into the Genuineness of the manuscript corrections in Mr. J. Payne Collier's annotated Shakespeare,* etc., small 4to. London: 1860.

This called forth a reply from Mr. Collier: *Mr. J. Payne Collier's Reply to Mr. N. E. S. A. Hamilton's "Inquiry,"* etc., 8vo., London: 1860.

The preface to Mr. Howard Staunton's edition of Shakespeare also contained many remarks in reference to the emendations.

An anonymous writer, calling himself "Scrutator," issued a pamphlet in 1860 entitled *Strictures on Mr. N. E. S. A. Hamilton's Inquiry,* etc. 8vo., London: 1860.

The same year Mr. Thomas Duffy Hardy, Assistant Keeper of the Public Records, issued *A Review of the present state of the Shakespearian Controversy.* 8vo., London: 1860.

Next Mr. A. E. Brae, still writing anonymously, published his *Collier, Coleridge and Shakespeare, A Review. By the author of "Literary Cookery."* 8vo., London: 1860.

The following year Dr. C. M. Ingleby issued his *Complete View of the Shakespeare Controversy.* 8vo., London: 1861. The book is what its title indicates. It is truly a most elaborate history of the whole controversy, but tinged with a strong bias against Mr. Collier.

Any one desiring to be informed about this interesting subject, cannot do better than consult this volume, bearing in mind the bias against Mr. Collier which it exhibits.

Finally Mr. Collier issued for private circulation a very interesting volume entitled *Trilogy Conversations between three friends on the emendations of Shakespeare's Text contained in Mr. Collier's corrected Folio*, 1632. Small 4to, London: 1874, a copy of which Mr. Collier kindly gave me. Only 50 copies were printed.

In 1875 Mr. Collier began what was really the last great work of his life, a new edition of Shakespeare's works, in small quarto form, most beautifully printed, the edition of which was limited to fifty copies. It was concluded in 1878, and is in eight volumes. A presentation copy from the Editor is in my library.

It contains the latest results of his study of the text, and is different from any of his previous editions. Many of the corrected folio 1632 emendations are embodied in the text.

As to the real history of the emendations, that will never be known, but will remain like many other things in literature a puzzle for all ages. Many have thought that Mr. Collier forged the emendations, but there is no reason for thinking so. I have too high an opinion of his character, and the great good he has done the cause of early English literature to think so myself for even an instant.

Perhaps some mischievous fellow, like George Steevens, that Puck of commentators, was at the bottom of their authorship. I believe Mr. Collier's story as to the finding of the 1632 folio, etc., implicitly. He was a great scholar, a most industrious worker, and one of the kindest men that ever lived. Many years ago I was able to do him a slight service, and he never forgot it. It led to many years of warm friendship which will always be remembered by me with feelings of the most pleasant character.

## Notes and Queries.

MESSRS. EDITORS: Permit me to suggest that an interesting and useful Department of SHAKESPEARIANA can be had, by making it the depository of Critical and Explanatory Notes on the TEXT of the Poet; conjectural suggestions of readings and punctuation; grammatical and historical scraps illustrative of obsolete words, idioms, and customs; collations from contemporary authors; and all such odds and ends as a close and industrious student pencils on the margins and fly leaves of his books, slips of paper, envelopes, etc., to be forthwith mislaid, and never ready when wanted for reference. The trouble would be but little more to send these to SHAKESPEARIANA, where, if found noteworthy, they can be methodized and printed, and thus made valuable in future, both to the writers, and to every one interested in Shakespearian literature. "When found, make a Note of" is a sagacious proverb; and had the good Captain never uttered another word, this would have ranked him among the philosophers; but he ought to have added "and lay it by where you can find it" to make it efficient. To the Shakespeare notes, more probably than to any other, is it due that the early numbers of *Notes and Queries* have become so scarce as to be practically unobtainable; and the same is measureably true of *Sabin's Bibliopolist*, and *Robinson's Epitome*, in this country. It is not necessary that these Notes be in every case original; frequently a Shakespearian suggestion, or phraseological explanation, occurs in miscellaneous reading, that is apt to be lost for want of attention; and all such will find their level of merit when brought together in the crucible of textual criticism. I should stipulate that they be new, or at least something not commonly known, conservative, pointed, and brief;

"Because too much obscures the sight  
As often as too little light."

With your permission, I will make a beginning with one, as a sample of what I mean; and hope that our Shakespeare students, whose number I am happy to know is daily increasing, especially among the young, will give us a column of "Textual Notes and Queries" in every number.

Whoever has read *Antony and Cleopatra* will remember the passage (I., iv., 49,) in which Alexas, describing to the Queen his meeting with Antony, says (*Folio*, 1623):

"So he nodded,  
And soberly did mount an Arme-gaunte Steede,  
Who neigh'd so hye, that what I would have spoke,  
Was beastly dumbe by him."

Here "dumbe" is a misprint for *dumb'd*; but what in the world is "arme-gaunte"? Some explain it as thin in the "arm" or shoulder, indicating a high-bred animal; others, a war-steed, gaunt or lean by overwork, from carrying its own coat-of-mail, and a full-armed, heavy-weight rider. Then come the emendators: Hanmer gives "arm-girt," the reading adopted by almost all modern editors; Steevens, "termagant," a conjecture of Mason's; Becket, "arm-vaunt"; Jackson, "war-gaunt"; Singer, "arrogant," a conjecture of Boaden's; Lettsom, "rampaunt"; Bulloch, "merchant"; and, lastly, Mr. Kinnear, in his new book\* on the tough places in Shakespeare, warmly advocates "ardent."

But is not the old word correct, only it has never been accurately explained? Brinsley Nicholson, M.D., of London, says so, and as a sound and trustworthy critic he is seldom astray. In the *Antiquarian Magazine* (London), for April, 1883, he says that "arm-gaunt" is *arm-gaunted*, the same as *arm-gauntleted*, armor-gloved; the horse's caparison, by its links and hinges, fitting it closely all over, as we still say, *like a glove*, a skin-fit. In French it would have been *ganté en fer*, but Shakespeare spelled it *gaunt* because he so spelled *gauntlet*. "Arm-girt" expresses the sense, and that is probably the reason it is usually adopted; but it is very prosaic compared with "arm-gaunt," itself a striking word-picture, and probably coined by the poet. To the audiences at the Globe and Blackfriars, who often witnessed such steel-clad, proudly-curvetting steeds, the term would be perfectly intelligible. We have all seen pictures of them; and in the Tower of London I have myself seen statues of horses exactly so arm-gaunted. The omission of the participial *ed* after *t* and *d* is a well-known usage of Shakespeare. Cf., "the *bloat* King," in Hamlet; "an *enshield* beauty," in Measure for Measure; "an *ingraft* infirmity," Othello; "a heart never yet *taint* with love," in I. Henry VI, and many others. We find the same also in Bacon.

It seems to me, then, that Dr. Nicholson has given us an explanation of the old term that, like the word itself, fits the context of the passage all round, *like a glove*. He was no lean, raw-boned hack that Gen. Antony mounted, but a full-blooded war-horse, dressed from head to foot in a suit of steel plates so accurately fitted, that no motion was impeded. Proud of himself, his harness, and his rider, he "smelled the battle afar off," as we may know at once by his neighing so high that poor Alexas was perfectly dumb-founded.

I have in mind two or three other Notes on the same play, but this is already too long; and not

\* CRUCES SHAKESPEARIANÆ: difficult passages in the Works of Shakespeare; with original emendations and notes, by B. G. Kinnear. London: George Bell & Sons, 1883. 12 mo., pp. 507. This handsome volume, containing, among many that are inadmissible, several conjectures and explanations well worthy of critical attention, I hope to see noticed at length in an early number of the SHAKESPEARIANA.

wishing to tire your readers at the beginning, I will reserve the rest for another occasion.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH CROSBY.

Zanesville, Ohio,

Sept. 11, 1883.

MESSRS. EDITORS: There is a passage in *Tempest* which is susceptible of two interpretations, and I am still in doubt which to accept as true. The lines occur in the course of *Prospero's* narration to his daughter of the story of his life. He says:

"I, thus neglecting worldly ends, all dedicated  
To closeness and the bettering of my mind  
With that which, but by being so retired,  
O'er-prized all popular rate."

TP. I. ii., 89-92.

Delius explains it: "That which except for *its* being withdrawn from the knowledge of the people would have risen above all the estimation set upon it by them." The Philadelphia editors, commenting on the passage (Notes on *Tempest*,

privately printed, 1865), disagreed with Delius and defined it: "That which, *were it only* for the retirement it procured *me*, was worth more to me than all popularity." Rolfe accepts this interpretation, but Hudson defends Delius by paraphrasing the lines: "Which would have exceeded all popular estimate but that it withdrew me from my public duties."

Schmidt, *Shakespeare-Lexicon* defines *but* in this line to mean unless, if not, which gives the passage the meaning assigned to it by Delius and Hudson. It seems to me that this is the only interpretation that accords with the sentiment that is swaying *Prospero* at the moment. He is stung by the recollection that by his exclusive devotion to those studies that were his passion he had left the State at the mercy of his unscrupulous brother, and brought long banishment upon himself and his child. Perhaps some of your readers can give a good argument in defense of the other explanation.

H. S. A.

## The Drama.

HENRY IRVING.

HENRY IRVING is England's greatest living interpreter of the Shakespearian drama. From his countrymen he has been for several years the recipient of honors such as have never before been conferred upon any actor of the English stage. On the fourth of July, previous to his departure for America, he was entertained at a banquet in London and the highest tribute was paid to his genius by the memorable assembly on that occasion. Men of all professions and pursuits met to do honor to the English stage represented by the man who had been foremost in the endeavor to elevate and refine it and to keep it in that atmosphere of the ideal from which the modern drama, left entirely to commercial enterprise, has such a constant tendency to sink. Lord Chief Justice Coleridge who presided at the dinner spoke high praise of Irving when he said "It does not become me now, I have not the skill or power, to analyze critically Mr. Irving's genius, to weigh it in the balance of opinion, or to say that in this or in that it is deficient. It is sufficient to be sure that he has the extraordinary and unusual power of conveying the conception of the part which he acts, and making us comprehend what is in his own mind and what is his own distinct intellectual conviction."

The popularity of Irving has been of slow growth and was attained only by that patient discipline and tireless devotion to perfection of detail without which greatness in any line of work cannot be won. John Henry Brodribb Irving was born at Keintan, near Glastonbury, in Somerset, on February 6, 1838. He appears to have had native dramatic tendencies. At school it was his passion to declaim those poems classed by his

worthy teacher among the "theatrical." The enthusiasm and natural force of the boy attracted the attention of Creswick the actor who encouraged him and advised him from his own wide experience. At the age of 14 Irving was placed in the office of an East India merchant in London, but the larger part of his time he contrived to employ in an elocution class. Effort breeds ability and the boy Irving, glowing with the consciousness of enhanced capacity, soon resolved upon the stage as his profession. His first public appearance was at the opening of the Lyceum Theater, Sunderland, in the part of *Orleans* in "Richelieu." His excitement so overmastered him that the result was by no means successful. He played again as *Cleomenes* in "Winter's Tale" with no more satisfactory effect. At this period he one night entirely forgot the words of his part owing it is said to his refusal to learn them on Sunday. Suddenly calling to mind an irrelevant line from another play he exclaimed: "Come on to the market-place and I'll tell thee further," and fled precipitately from the scene followed by the laughter of the audience and the curses of the stage manager. He remained more than two years in training at the Theater Royal, Edinburgh, and came in 1859 to London to play under the management of Augustus Harris at the Princess's Theater. The engagement however was very quickly canceled, as Irving found that he was condemning himself to perpetual mediocrity by binding himself to the playing of subordinate parts. He returned to the "provinces" and with patient practice and severe discipline sought to perfect all the details of his art. He played for a long time in comedy at Manchester, but in 1865 preparatory to going again to London he undertook in spite of the jokes and mockery of his

friends to impersonate *Hamlet* and achieved at once a position and complete success. On coming to London he declined Fechter's terms and joined Dion Boucicault's provincial company on condition that if he should develop artistic ability he should have an engagement as leading actor. His first part in London was that of *Doricourt* in the "Belles' Stratagem," at the St. James Theater. He played successfully at the Queen's Theater and the Vaudeville. At the latter he first became notorious through his performance of *Digby Grant* in "Two Roses." Until this time he had excelled in acting parts of the *Bill Sykes* order, but whether in comedy, melodrama or tragedy, he seemed to lie close to the secret of the character he was studying. After years of routine labor, playing *Mathias*, *Charles I.*, *Eugene Aram*, and *Richelieu* he appeared in the autumn of 1874 as *Hamlet*. It was the culminating moment in his career. "As early as 3 o'clock in the afternoon of the 31st of October," says the *Dublin Monthly Magazine*, (September 1879), "the crowd began to form at the pit door of the Lyceum and soon a struggling, seething mass of human beings extended down the covered way right out into the Strand. The pit that night was a memorable spectacle. Never had that tribunal been so highly charged with anxiety, impatience and enthusiasm." The success was beyond all expectation, and the impression made by this great achievement was deep and widespread. The newspapers and magazines of the next few months are flooded with dissertations on Mr. Irving's *Hamlet* or on particular characteristics of it. Irving had not expected to play *Hamlet* more than 50 nights; the popular interest was still strong at twice that many; Irving was the Dane for 200 successive nights. *Macbeth* was repeated 80 times, and *Othello* followed close upon it. From this time Irving's right to the title of a great interpreter of Shakespeare has been very generally allowed. He has enjoyed the friendship of Gladstone and Tennyson and secured for the latter the production of "Queen Mary," himself playing the part of *Philip*.

There has not of course been absolute unanimity among the guides of public opinion as to the exact rank among great actors which Mr. Irving is entitled to take. Indeed there is still a violent controversy raging as to his real merits, some critics insisting that he is great only in melodrama, others finding serious fault with his mannerisms and taking exception to his love of splendor and attention to minutiae. It is particularly important if we would pass a proper judgment upon Irving and carry away from his acting the most valuable results, that we should discover his theory of his art, and fortunately the means of ascertaining this have already been placed in our hands. There has been published this year an excellent translation by Walter Herries Pollock of Diderot's *Paradox on the Comedian*, and the book which is the very best ever written on the actor's art has been enriched by an introduction from the pen of Mr. Irving. The paradox which Diderot so eloquently expands and comments on is that "sensibility" or the display of actually felt passion is out of place on the stage and is bad art. This theorem became the

basis of Lessing's valuable dramatic criticism and recently Gustave Garcia in a work dedicated to Irving, and M. Coquelin of the *Comedie Francaise* in his very interesting little book on the *Actor and his Art* have still further confirmed and developed it. Diderot is undoubtedly right in his theory and has been agreed with by all good thinkers, but Mr. Irving, whose introduction is no less interesting for the fallacy in his analysis, ignores the circumstances that condition Diderot's view. He is vexed at the passionless attitude indicated by Diderot toward himself and his fellow actors. Irving has a large conception of the range and value of his art, and is jealous that the art of acting shall be treated as seriously as the art of composing. Until Diderot has been carefully studied and often read, the paradox is repellent. It seems to disregard the possibility of genius in the actor and makes of him a mere machine, capable of so much routine work. Irving's verdict might then have been anticipated. Moreover Diderot's definition of the great actor is contrary to all Irving's ideas of what constitutes fine acting. Diderot says: "What then is a great actor? A man who having learnt the words set down for him by the author fools you thoroughly whether in tragedy or comedy. Like other gymnastics, acting taxes only the bodily strength. The actor feels neither trouble nor sorrow, nor depression of soul. All these emotions he has given to you. The actor is tired, you are happy; he has had exertion without feeling, you feeling without exertion." On the other hand the *Academy* of Feb. 10, 1877 said: "Irving is not a mechanical actor and is therefore very unequal. There are few actors of the first rank on the stage of whom it is more difficult to speak finally from the experience of only one performance." Diderot shows conclusively that all work of enduring excellence is done with the head and that actors who play from the heart merely have no self-possession and are necessarily very unequal in their acting. But says Irving, "the exaltation of sensibility in art may be difficult, but it is none the less real to all who have felt its power." We have, then, in Mr. Irving, an actor of a very different style from Forrest, Salvini, and the men of the muscular school. He is a man of large scholastic attainments, and fine poetic instinct. Feeling deeply the secret of the character he assumes, he aims to interpret that secret to his audience by any means not false to art. Improbably no Shakespearian drama does the intellectual capacity of Irving show more clearly than in *Shylock*. The *Shylock* of Booth is an avaricious, bloodthirsty villain, that of Irving in the words of M. D. Conway, "a fatal, powerful and pathetic character," and Mr. Conway goes on to say that it has been chiefly through the efforts of Henry Irving that the character of *Shylock* has been divested of the malign associations burdened upon it by tradition. Much might be written upon the original interpretations of Shakespeare that Mr. Irving has given us but it is our intention to extend a hearty welcome to Mr. Irving in whom we recognize a living Shakespearian teacher rather than to anticipate criticism.

## THE DRAMATIC SEASON.

THE dramatic season of 1883-4, which has now fully opened, promises to be one of unusual brilliancy. One of its happiest features is the increased attention to the Shakespearian drama. It were not to assert too much to say that more of Shakespeare will be played upon the boards of the American theater and better played, during the coming Winter, than ever before. Among the celebrities who will essay leading Shakespearian rôles will be Irving, Ristori, Booth, Modjeska, McCullough, Barrett, Rhea, Keene, Shewell, Linde, McAuley, Janauschek, Margaret Mather, Ellen Terry, Clara Morris, and others. While few of these may be justly classed as great actors or actresses, the large majority are hard-working, intelligent, and conscientious interpreters of the poet's plays. The season will be memorable for many novelties to the American public. Ristori, whose Lady Macbeth is among the greatest personations of the modern stage, will again visit America. Henry Irving, with Miss Terry and the entire Lyceum Company, will interpret to America the deeper meanings of the dramatist. McAuley, an excellent comedian, will gladden the laughter-loving public with a revival of the character of *Falstaff*, and it is to be hoped that he will give the whole of *Falstaff*, the Merry Wives of Windsor, as well as the two parts of Henry the Fourth. Modjeska has been spending the entire Summer in needed preparations for essaying the difficult and beautiful rôle of *Imogen*.

Yet another indication of the increased appreciation of Shakespeare is the organization of a special Shakespeare Company. The pleasure of noting this experiment was greatly increased by a consciousness of the fact that the star system, at present so greatly in vogue, is wholly unsuited to the proper production of Shakespeare's plays. The George Edgar Shakespearian Company opened in Chicago with *Lear*, but failed largely through mismanagement. A second trial was made at New York, where they played *Othello* and *Romeo and Juliet* to the evident acceptance of the Metropolitan critics.

It is much to be regretted, however, that these artists continue their present policy of limiting their *repertoires* to a few plays only of the great dramatist. It is true that some ten plays of the poet are almost nightly performed in some part of the civilized world. *Hamlet*, *Lear*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Othello*, *Julius Caesar*, *As You Like It*, *Merchant of Venice*, and *Richard the Third* have so strong a hold upon popular favor as to render their neglect by our actors at

once impolitic and undesirable. But without commenting upon the slovenly disregard of proper text and appropriate scenery and costume, with which they are too frequently presented, and which alone should convince the doubter that the age of Shakespearian mutilation has not passed, should only a one-sided aspect of this myriad-sided man be given? Where are the Merry Wives of Windsor, Twelfth Night, Much Ado About Nothing, Midsummer Night's Dream, Winter's Tale, Tempest, Antony and Cleopatra, Macbeth, Henry VIII., King Henry IV., etc.? Why should managers give large royalties for the right to present translations of the worst French comedies, when *Falstaff*, the richest creation of the comic muse, is neglected and almost forgotten by the present generation of theater goers? Certainly, that thoroughly American excuse, "they pay better," cannot be urged in this connection, for no less eminent an authority than Edwin Booth testifies to the drawing powers of Shakespeare's plays and their popularity with the public. He says:

"In America Shakespeare is everywhere received with enthusiasm and listened to with a thorough understanding of every word. I find the *largest* and *most refined* audiences that I draw present at the performances of Richard the Third, Hamlet or Macbeth, although I have frequently changed my plays to test the public taste. The managers of the theaters, at which I play, whose business it is to feel the public pulses, uniformly request me, when I have suggested a change to other than Shakespearian plays, not to do so, as I would abandon that which is *most profitable to them*, because *most to the public taste*. This I found not only in the great cities, but every where, in Galveston as well as in New York. My Shakespearian nights have been *my greatest successes, financially and popularly*."

SHAKESPEARIANA welcomes, then, these many indications of an enhanced appreciation of the great dramatist, for the representation of his plays upon the stage is among the many and best methods, and that which he himself mainly selected, of teaching his grand lesson and widening the sphere of his usefulness. A class of persons thus are reached, upon whom the ennobling and elevating influence of the poet would never otherwise be exerted, for many who hear and see Shakespeare before the curtain never read him in the study. The more the masses hear of Shakespeare the better will it be for their intellectual tastes and moral tendencies. Let us then have all of Shakespeare's plays, presented precisely as he wrote and arranged them, omit none of the emendations of a Cibber, or of any other member of the tribe of interpolators.

## Shakespearian Societies.

[The secretaries of Shakespearian Societies are invited to furnish the minutes of their meetings and whatever is of value and interest in their essays and discussions for publication in this department.]

**THE OLD CAMBRIDGE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.**—As defined in its constitution, the object of this society is "both literary and social. In general, to bring together those interested in literary pursuits and in particular to promote an interest in the writings of Shakespeare." The officers, consisting of a President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer, are balloted for at the annual meeting. Fortnightly meetings are held beginning the first Tuesday in October until the end of May at the residences of the different members. A committee of three are appointed at each meeting to select a play and assign the parts. The association numbers about 90 members, including Rev. H. N. Hudson, W. J. Rolfe, Profs. G. M. Lane, J. M. Peirce and Louis Dyce of Harvard College, Col. T. W. Higginson, Dr. Geo. Z. Gray, Rev. E. H. Hall, Prof. C. E. Fay of Tufts' College, H. O. Houghton of the Riverside Press, Chas. T. Russell, Rev. F. W. Holland, D. D., and Dr. C. E. Vaughan.

Since January, the association has read *King Lear*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Hamlet*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Merchant of Venice* and *Comedy of Errors*. The method of study consists in reading the plays, the parts being prepared beforehand, with occasional lectures. Last winter, the Rev. H. N. Hudson delivered a course of lectures on the plays of Shakespeare before the association.

WALTER DEANE, Secretary.

**THE MONTREAL SHAKESPEARE CLUB.**—This society, which was organized in February, 1882, concluded its second session in May, 1883, having studied during the year, *Love's Labor's Lost*, *King John*, *As You Like It*, *Hamlet* and *The Tempest*. Weekly meetings are held for the purpose of reading and discussion, and at the conclusion of each play, one or more nights are devoted to the reading and discussion of essays. The following papers were read during the last session:—

By H. Abbott,—The Character of *Polonius*.

By E. W. Arthy.—(1) The Extent of Shakespeare's Latin Scholarship, as shown in *Love's Labor's Lost*; (2) The Melancholy of *Jacques*; (3) The character of *Ophelia*.

By R. W. Boodle, (the Secretary).—(1) *Love's Labor's Lost*, with special reference to Euphemism; (2) Historical Study of the Reign of John, from a Shakespearian Point of View; (3) The Character of *Hamlet*; (4) The Scope of the *Tempest*.

By C. S. Campbell.—Shakespearian Folk-lore.

By C. H. Gould.—The Character of *Laertes*.

By T. D. King.—(1) General Remarks upon *Love's Labor's Lost*; (2) Shakespeare's Loyalty and Patriotism, as shown by King John; (3) Emendation of a Disputed Passage in *Hamlet*: "As stars with trains of fire," etc.; (4) An Allegorical Interpretation of the *Tempest*, read before the Jacksonville Plato Club.

By Arch. McGowan.—(1) Shakespearian Pronunciation; (2) The Character of *Horatio*.

By F. McLennan.—The Character of *Miranda*.

By Rev. Canon Norman.—Shakespeare and His Influence on the English Language.

By J. Ready.—The Religious Movements of Shakespeare's Age.

The third session, beginning early in October, will be devoted to the study of the following plays: *Richard II*, *A Winter's Tale*, *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth* and *King Lear*.

R. W. BOODLE, Hon. Secretary.

**THE NEW SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA.**—This society must not be confounded with the Shakespeare Society of Philadelphia, an association of some ten years' standing, nor with that still older society, known as the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society, of which Dr. Horace Howard Furness is the Dean, and which is well and favorably known in Shakespearian circles, as the Philadelphia Editors. The New Shakespeare Society of Philadelphia is of younger though perhaps of as vigorous a growth. During the last winter it met fortnightly from the 5th of October, 1882 till the evening of June 2, 1883. Its method of study is to devote the greater part of the evening to a critical study of the text, one scene or less being the limit of the evening's work and the remaining time is given to carefully prepared essays on subjects suggested by the text under discussion. The play that was studied during the last winter was *The Tempest*; eighteen meetings were devoted to its perusal and thirty-eight essays were read on this and collateral subjects. Among these were the following:—

By A. H. Smyth, (President).—(1) The Study of Shakespeare; (2) History of the *Tempest*; (3) Dramatic Construction of *Tempest*; (4) The Character of *Prospero*.

By H. M. Bowden.—(1) Sea Knowledge of Shakespeare; (2) Shakespeare and English Colonization; (3) A Study of *Caliban*.

By Rev. J. Taylor Hamilton.—(1) Character of *Ariel*; (2) Character of *Miranda*; (3) *Gonzalo's* Scheme of Government.

By Isidore Schwab.—(1) A Look into *The Tempest*; (2) On the Unities in Shakespeare; (3) Character of *Antonio*.

By James M. Beck, (Secretary).—(1) Sources of the Plot of *The Tempest*; (2) Shakespeare on Fate; (3) Shakespeare's Knowledge of Music; (4) History of the Masque; (5) Character of *Gonzalo*.

By C. O. Beasley.—The Liberal Arts.

By W. S. Holzer.—Myriad Moods of a Myriad Mind.

In addition to these, an entire meeting, the last of the year, was devoted to the reading of an essay by each member on the subject: "Impressions of *The Tempest*." The society resumed their sessions on the last Saturday of September. The play selected for study during the coming winter is *Coriolanus*.

JAMES M. BECK, Secretary.

**THE ATLANTA SHAKESPEARE CLUB** is a social society, which meets fortnightly for the purpose of reading Shakespeare. Although its chief object is the mere reading of the play, and no pretense is made to a critical study of the text, yet incidentally much is learned, inquiries are awakened and discussions ensue.

E. G. RENICK.

THE PHILADELPHIA SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY was organized in 1872, and soon after its formation it commenced a critical study of the plays of Shakespeare.

The plan of work of the society is to commence study on a play early in the Fall, and, by meeting once a week, an entire play is gone through with before the adjournment for the summer months. Since its organization the following plays have been studied: *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Tempest*, *Richard III.*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *King John*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *A Winter's Tale*, *The Merchant of Venice*, the first part of *King Henry IV.*, and the second part of *King Henry IV.*, and work has already commenced on *Julius Cæsar*. Careful attention is given to the text, parallel passages are collated from the various plays and from contemporary dramatists, and the writings of authors contemporary with Shakespeare are read as a part of the regular work of the society.

The nucleus of a library has been formed, and it is intended to make some additions during the present year.

Through the courtesy of some of its members the society holds its meetings at 206 south 7th street, but at present there are but ten members, as follows: Andrew M. Beveridge, Frederick W. Coxe, Harry W. Dunne, Samuel Heilner, A. Julian Hemphill, Francis Henderson, Henry S. Pancoast, James L. Penny-packer, Samuel D. Philips and Albert D. Weimer.

AVON SHAKESPEARE CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY. This excellent Shakespeare Society commenced on the 1st of October its fourteenth year of study. It is composed of from forty to fifty ladies and gentlemen, and meets on every alternate Monday evening from early October to the latter part of April. The subjects to which the society devotes its attention are not exclusively Shakespearian in their nature, the discussion of the poet this year being varied by a de-

scription of the great cities of the world. Its plan of study is to appoint a member to prepare an essay on the topic of the evening, which is then read and discussed. One of its rules of order will bear reprinting, for though it is the unwritten law in all literary societies its frequent infraction and want of observance is the most fruitful source of their failure. It reads as follows:

"1. Every one is expected to do his duty. We believe in reciprocity. Good you have received; good return."

The following is a list of the subjects for discussion during the coming year, with the appointed essayist:

- Oct. 15. Life of Shakespeare, A. K. Rodgers.
  - Oct. 29. The Shakespeare-Bacon Controversy, W. H. Rossington.
  - Nov. 12. Sources of the Subjects of the Comedies, C. J. Brown.
  - Nov. 26. Shakespeare's Heroines, J. D. McFarland.
  - Dec. 10. Shakespeare Heroes, Miss Lucy Kingman.
  - Jan. 7. Taming of the Shrew, A. M. F. Randolph.
  - Jan. 21. Merchant of Venice, J. G. Slonecker.
  - Feb. 4. Shakespeare's Witches, Fairies and Goblins, A. H. Thompson.
  - Feb. 18. Study of Macbeth, C. W. Price.
  - March 3. Study of Hamlet, Robert Pierce.
  - March 17. Religious and Moral Influences of Shakespeare, Mrs. W. W. Stilson.
  - March 31. Humor of Shakespeare, J. F. Griffin.
  - April 14. Chronology and Review of the Plays, Mrs. W. H. Rossington.
- On December 17th the society will hold a special Shakespeare Festival; and on April 23d they will close their year of study by uniting with all good Shakespearians in a banquet in honor of their Patron Saint.

## Reviews.

### PROFESSOR THOM'S SHAKESPEARE EXAMINATIONS.\*

The story of this interesting little book is briefly told. In 1881, Mr. W. Taylor Thom, Professor of English Literature in Hollins Institute, Va., determined that his pupils should compete for the prize of books annually offered by the New Shak. Soc. for college proficients in the study of the poet. Accordingly two young ladies, Miss E. A. Mertins, of Alabama, and Miss H. Wilson, of South Carolina, exhaustively studied the play of Hamlet for examination. The questions, prepared by Mr. H. H. Furness, of Philadelphia, were, as might be supposed, very comprehensive, and divided into Historical and Bibliographical, Grammatical, Philological and Æsthetic. The papers of both candidates were deemed so excellent, and of so nearly equal merit, that it was decided to forward both sets to London: and Mr. Furnivall, in a very complimentary letter, not only awarded to each the regular book prizes, but presented to them copies of the fac-simile 1603 and 1604 Quartos of Hamlet. The next year Miss N. B. Bowman, of Virginia, passed a similar examination in Macbeth, and gained the Society's prize for 1882.

\* Two Shakespeare Examinations: with some Remarks on Thom, M. A. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co., 1883. 12mo, pp. 154.

Several teachers, hearing of Prof. Thom's success, appealed to him for his methods of putting the Poet before his classes; and accordingly he has here printed these examinations *verbatim*, and appended an original essay of some thirty pages on the Class-room Study of Shakespeare. In these "Remarks" he tells a plain unvarnished tale of all the witchcraft he has used; of his text-books, and how to use them; and how to lead the pupil from the study of the Poet's idiomatic language, the dramatic usages, and the manners and customs of the age, up to making an æsthetic analysis of each play and its characters. They are full of practical thought and suggestiveness; and being the outcome of experience, and not merely the conclusions of theory, cannot fail of being of great service to all engaged in teaching Shakespeare and English literature, and the volume deserves a large circulation. Some of his points Mr. Thom might have expanded with advantage. For instance, when speaking of the language of common life, as distinguished from the written language of literature, being full of Shakespeare's ideas to this day, he says (p. 123), "Especially is this true, sometimes very amusingly so, of the Negro talk of Virginia,—their speech being largely the spoken tongue of 200 years ago or more." A few

the Class-room Study of Shakespeare: By William Taylor

examples of these expressions would have been gratifying, and we feel like asking Mr. Thom to edify the readers of SHAKESPEARIANA with a paper on this subject.

We observe that the professor is an earnest advocate for placing the notes of school editions at the end of the book or play, and not at foot of the page. In this educational doctors differ; Rolfe, the Clarendon Press, and the Collins' Series putting them by themselves; while Hudson, Hunter and the Rugby Series give them under the text. Mr. Thom's plan has always seemed to us to involve an impatient waste of time and distraction of thought. If a word or phrase is to be explained at all, the pupil wants it at once. Mr. Thom argues that turning over leaves to look up an explanation gives time for thought, and the pupil is surprised or gratified to find that the explanation given agrees with, or differs from, what he or she had conjectured. But isn't this very fanciful? When an explanation is wanted, the pupil's whole thought is how to get it as soon and conveniently as possible, and any delay in hunting it up must only produce irritation and disturbance in the scholar's mind, that will do more harm than good, if not often deter from the search altogether. However, not having had any practical experience in teaching, we cannot speak by the book. In the recitation and examination room, of course, nothing but the simple text is permissible.

It is painful to state, in concluding this notice, that this book has, touching its author, something of an *In Memoriam* character. Miss Mertins, one of the young ladies mentioned above, who shortly after this examination became the wife of Mr. Thom, died at Hollins Institute within a short year of her marriage. She was an accomplished and amiable woman, and her decease is deeply lamented by all who had the pleasure of her acquaintance.

JOSEPH CROSBY.

[We print below a list of the questions given by Prof. Thom and answered by Miss Maggie C. Williams, of Va., in the Shakespeare Prize Examination of this session, June, 1883, at Hollins Institute, Virginia. They will be of service to teachers who contemplate the introduction of Shakespeare into their classes. The references are to the Clarendon Press edition.]

#### THE SHAKESPEARE PRIZE EXAMINATION IN KING LEAR.

1. When and in what form was King Lear first published?
2. How, according to Dowden, do we fix the order of the plays?
3. When was King Lear written, and how can you establish the time?
4. Where did Shakespeare get the materials of the play?
5. How do the original stories differ in conclusion from Shakespeare's play?
6. Was King Lear an original or an adapted play? Explain the following constructions and usages:
7. I. i. 88—"Return *those* duties back as are right fit."
- I. 4. 58—"With *that* ceremonious affection as you were wont."
8. I. i. 142—"Answer my life my judgment."
9. I. i. 152—"Thou *swear'st* thy gods in vain."
10. I. i. 183—"Hath rival'd for our daughter."
11. I. i. 196—"and *stranger'd* with our oath."
12. I. i. 212—"That *monsters* it."
13. I. i. 216—"If for I want that glib and oily art."
14. I. i. 223—"a *still-soliciting* eye."

15. I. i. 240—"Since *that* respects of fortune are his love, I cannot be his wife."
16. I. 2. 36—"The contents are to *blame*."
17. I. 2. 91 and 107—"I pray *you*" and "it shall lose *thee* nothing."
18. I. 3. 1—"For *chiding* of his Fool."
19. I. 4. 37—"Not so young, sir, to love a woman."
20. I. 4. 95—"an thou *canst* not smile."
21. I. 4. 177—"I would not be *thee*, nuncle."
22. I. 4. 191—"But *other* of your insolent retinue."
23. I. 4. 195—"To have found a safe redress."
24. I. 4. 275—"her brow of youth."
25. II. 4. 270—"If it be you that *stirs* these daughters' hearts."

Explain the following expressions:

26. I. i. 114—"And thought to *set my rest*."
27. I. 2. 4—"Permit the *curiosity* of nations."
28. I. 2. 121—"fa, sol, la, mi."
29. I. 4. 17—"and to eat no fish."
30. I. 4. 252—"more hideous when thou showest thee \* \* \* the sea monster."
31. I. 5. 1 and 6—"these letters" and "your letter"—how used?
32. II. 2. 14 to 17—"three-suited" "worsted-stock-ing" "lily-livered," "one-trunk-inheriting."
33. II. 2. 74—"Turn their *halycon* beams."
34. II. 2. 80—"drive ye cackling home to Camelot."
35. III. 2. 10—"Court *holy water* in a dry house."
36. III. 6. 73—"Poor Tom, thy horn is dry."
37. I. 5. 29—"Take *this note*."
37. V. 3. 28—"Take *thou this note*." cf. V. 3. 245.
38. IV. 6. 158—"This a good *block*."
39. IV. 7. 17—"Child-changed father."
40. IV. 7. 80—"To make him *even d'er* the time he has lost."
41. I. i. 115—"Hence and avoid my sight" to whom addressed?

42. I. i. 140 { "Reverse thy doom" [O] } The best  
 { "Reserve thy state" [F] } reading and why?

43. I. 2. 89-91—"To his father that so tenderly and entirely loves him"—is this in keeping with the character of Gloucester? Why should it be regarded as an interpolation?

44. II. 4. 207-8—"To be a comrade with the wolf and howl Necessity's sharp pinch;" or—"with the wolf and owl—Necessity's sharp pinch." Best reading?

45. IV. 2. 62—"Thou changed and *self covered* thing, for shame, Bemonster not thy feature."

46. Spedding's division of Acts IV. and V.

47. V. 3. 306—"And my poor fool is hanged"—Is Lear in the incoherence of dying grief, confusing the Fool and Cordelia?

48. III. 6. 20 to 91—What do you understand to take place, which causes Lear's outbreak in II. 52-54?

49. How do you understand that Gloucester's eyes are put out; and what do you think of the propriety of this scene?

50. The Fool in King Lear—his function in the play. Was he a boy or a man?

51. What do you think of Cordelia's refusal to respond to Lear's desire for flattery; and had she, probably, made any further choice between France and Burgundy than appears on the surface?

52. Your idea of Goneril, physically, morally, and intellectually.

53. Does Shakespeare over-step the bounds of the natural—of human nature—in Goneril and Regan?

54. What is your opinion of the condition of Lear's mind in the opening scene? What effect does his increasing passion seem to have upon his faculties? Character of the King?

55. Cordelia's character and influence in the play—

upon the personages themselves, and upon our estimate of them?

56. What is the view of human society in King Lear—what the conflicting principles of human nature, the causes, destructive and conservative, of the prodigious upheaval in the play?

57. What is your idea of the aim and lesson of the play?

#### SHAKESPEARE FOR YOUNG FOLKS.

Mr. Robert R. Raymond, the well known interpreter of Shakespeare, and principal of the Boston school of oratory, has given us a beautiful book for the "Young folk." He has hit upon the excellent idea of awakening in young readers an interest in Shakespeare, and has executed the idea with fine taste and judgment. We consider Mr. Raymond very fortunate in his choice of plays; he has selected three dramas always fresh to every mind and representative of the best defined types of the Shakespearian drama. They are, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *As You Like It*, and *Julius Caesar*. Having always the interest of his readers in sight, Mr. Raymond judiciously "skips" passages, the understanding of which would require much literary culture, and neatly knits together the quoted portions with his clear and graceful narrative.

Let not the reader gather from the title of the book that it is intended only for children, it will, we have no doubt, serve also as an introduction to the riches of Shakespeare to many children of a larger growth who have, from one reason or another, neglected to acquaint themselves with the plays. Cultivated audiences have listened with delight to Mr. Raymond's Shakespearian readings, and each play in the present work is presented from his own selections for the platform. We trust that Mr. Raymond will furnish us with many more volumes on the same plan.

#### SHAKESPEARE AND GIORDANO BRUNO.

There has recently been privately circulated in England a translation of a portion of a new German work on the philosophy of Giordano Bruno.<sup>†</sup> The biography is of interest to the student of Shakespearian literature, as the author notes Bruno's influence upon the Elizabethan dramatists, and suggests several points of contact with Shakespeare. The ablest advocate of this relationship was Dr. Benno Tschischwitz ("Shakespeare-Forschungen I," Halle, 1868), who emphasized the parallelisms between Hamlet and Bruno's "Il candelajo" (a comedy), and "Spaccio della bestia trionfante," even asserting (p. 118) that in Act ii., Sc. ii., Hamlet is reading the "Spaccio." There is but a slight resemblance between the passages on which Dr. Tschischwitz constructs his theory. He finds the essential elements of the atomic theory in the famous soliloquy a relation between "good kissing carrion," and Bruno's "sol et homogeneant hominem," and in Hamlet's meditation upon the fate of the noble dust of Alexander a close similarity. Bruno's notion of the changing and flowing of the atoms. He instances one rather striking passage from "Il candelajo," where Octavio asks the pedant Manfurio, who, we are told, is the original of Polonius: "che e la materia di vostri versi?" and the pedant replies, "litteræ, syllabæ, dietio et oratio, partes propinqual et remotæ," and thereupon Octavio still further says: "Io dico, quale e il soggetto et il proposito?"

Falkson, *Giordano Bruno*, p. 289, approves the theory, and confirmatory evidence is given by Klein in his *Geschichte des Dramas*, showing that three Englishmen, Fynes Morison of Lincolnshire, Anton Evershed of Sussex, and Martin Turner of Yorke, were students at Wittenburg in 1592, four years after Bruno left the university, that Morison's *Itinerary* was most likely known to Shakespeare, and that from it he may have learned of Bruno, and so placed Hamlet at Wittenburg that he might learn of the doctrine of the Italian martyr.

Whatever may be thought of the justness of the conclusions at which some scholars have arrived, founded upon such fragmentary evidence, the investigation nevertheless is not altogether an idle one, but indeed becomes of wide and real interest as other questions of contemporary life become entangled with it. Giordano Bruno, the most interesting figure in the revolt against scholasticism, wandered through Europe from his home in Naples, until in 1583 he reached London, where, for three years, he lived at the court of Elizabeth, as George Henry Lewes said, "in the interchange of great thoughts and glorious aspirations, in the high communion of noble minds." In his lawless moods, Bruno was himself a true Elizabethan, constantly vibrating between fine fancy and obscenity and buffoonery. He became the friend of Fulke Greville and Sir Philip Sidney, to the latter dedicated his famous *Spaccio*, and, as none of his biographers neglect to mention, displayed in all his writing a profound knowledge of contemporary society. The philosophical position of Bruno is not difficult to determine, and an understanding of it is essential to the explanation of his parallel thinking with Shakespeare. There is a pause in the scientific method from Archimedes to Galileo. All the exhaustive researches of mathematicians and cosmographers in the wide interval culminated in the intellect of Copernicus, and prepared the way for Galileo and modern science. The tides of thought were setting from pedantry to originality. Between the schoolmen and modern thinkers stand the Italian philosophers from Petrarch to Campanella; Bruno and his associates proposed to the age the essential questions which have since shaken every school of modern European thought. Descartes' favorite axiom and all the reiterations of rationalism belonged to Bruno. He argued from his own personality out upon the universe, and taught before Bacon the true interrogation of Nature, observation and experiment. With Bruno and the kindred philosophers, there began to germinate all the seeds of thought whose outcome is now the wealth of the French, Dutch, German and English schools. Naturally the influence of this fiery, restless, urgent enthusiast was powerfully felt in England during his sojourn there, and his thoughts were common in the minds of cultivated men and appeared in the popular dramas of the day. There is a profound and vital saying of Lichtenberg, "perhaps we should say 'it thinks' as 'it lightens,'" that explains the whole secret of these, at times, perplexing parallelisms. Every man said Emerson is necessitated "by the air he breathes and the idea on which he and his contemporaries live and toil to share the manner of his times without knowing what that manner is." Unconsciously and according to the receptivity of his nature, he draws his culture from the prevailing ideas of his day and nation. It is impossible for any man, howsoever far-shining his pre-eminence may be, to remove himself from the world and think on altogether independent lives, as it is to hide colors from the sun. "Like

\* Shakespeare for the Young Folk. Edited by Robert R. Raymond, A.M. New York: Fords, Howard, and Hulbert.

† Dr. Herman Brunnhofer—"Giordano Bruno's Weltanschauung und Verhaengniss." Aus den Quellen dargestellt, gr. 8, (xxvi., 325 s.) Leipzig. 1883.

a gift the thoughts do flow" very subtly said Goethe. The spirit of the time gives the questions of prevailing curiosity to all its children. In the present theory, with very few exceptions, all the similar passages bear on topics of universal concernment at the close of the Sixteenth Century. It would be easy to prepare an equally curious list of resemblances between Bruno and almost any of Shakespeare's dramatic contemporaries; and not Hamlet alone, but the majority of Shakespeare's own works, would reveal, if scrutinized for the purpose, affinities with the heresies of Bruno. The tongue of Bruno is in that line of Julius Caesar: "Swear priests, and cowards and men cautelous."

J. C., II. 1. 129.

and Edmund's speech in King Lear I, II, beginning "This is the excellent foppery of the world," is a precise summary of the main teaching of the *Spaccio*.

But neither Tschischwitz nor Brunnhofer are unreasonable theorists, and the former does not insist upon the unqualified acceptance of his hypothesis. He only asserts, and with reason in his favor, that when Shakespeare wrote Hamlet he had ascended to the summit of the consciousness that had

been attained in that day. That is it. Hamlet, the skeptical mind was constructed out of the speculative elements in the thoughts of the century, and necessarily included in its compass the philosophy that Bruno represented. We welcome therefore the approaching publication in England of a new Life and Works of Bruno, believing that each revelation of the scope of the forces of the Elizabethan age gives us increased knowledge of its living thought.

This entire subject of literary parallels, answering for the "Baconian theory" as well as for Bruno, has been most admirably defined by John Morley. He says: "Then as always the monumental writers only gathered up, arranged, developed and enforced ideas that were already substantially in the air and floating in the minds of men. Every one even of foremost capacity imbibes the subjects of intellectual interest from the working of the larger causes that are current in his age. He accepts in the main the speculative dialect of his age, and what is not less important, but more, he accepts the prevailing notions as to what constitutes demonstration or probable evidence in the leading object of the curiosity of the time."

## Miscellany.

Prof. Rolfe has been spending his summer in Europe.

Denton J. Snider was one of the lecturers this year at the Concord Summer School of Philosophy.

Dr. Horace Howard Furness is busy at his edition of Othello. It will be the fifth play in his edition.

Dr. Brinsley Nicholson has left the New Shakespeare Society and will be greatly missed, as he was one of its ablest writers.

Before the Browning Society some time since, Rev. J. D. Williams read a paper on *Gwendolen* as compared to Shakespeare's *Beatrice*, and at the same meeting the tone was contrasted, in which music is spoken of by Milton and Shakespeare.

Rev. H. N. Ellacombe has made the discovery that Shakespeare was also an angler.

Amongst the recent additions to Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps's Shakespeare Museum, at Hollingbury Copse, Brighton, England, are two objects of peculiar interest. One is an original and hitherto unknown indenture of 1596, referring to connections of the Shakespeare family, the poet's father, John Shakespeare, being one of the witnesses. The other is the original deed of the transfer of the legal estate of the Blackfriars property, 1618, in trust to follow the directions of Shakespeare's will.

We are glad to note that at the University of Michigan, Shakespeare is systematically studied, and over forty members of the Senior Class have this year elected to take the course. Mr. James McMillan, of Detroit, presented the University with \$6,500, to found a Shakespearian library, and with this gift over two thousand volumes of texts and "ana" have been purchased. We may confidently expect good work from Ann Arbor.

*Harper's Magazine* will shortly commence a new story by William Black, entitled "Judith Shakespeare, Her Love Affairs and Other Adventures." The heroine is Shakespeare's daughter, and the immortal dram-

atist himself with many of the characters of his plays will take a conspicuous part in the action of the story. The scene is laid in Stratford-on-Avon, and all that can be truly said to be historical will be utilized by the novelist. E. A. Abbey will furnish the illustrations, and the story is said to be of sufficient length to run through twelve numbers.

James H. Hubbard in *The Nation* for August 30, 1883, claims a pre-eminence for the second edition of Shakespeare, published in 1807, by Munroe & Francis, Boston, over all other American editions, so far as regards the awakening of an interest in Shakespeare's works in America. This judgment is based upon the marked success with which its introduction into our colleges was attended.

Till now it has been commonly supposed that the first representation of Romeo and Juliet in Germany dates from 1626. The *Revue Critique*, however, quotes a document, published by Herr Karl Trautmann in the *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, according to which the first representation of Romeo and Juliet known in Germany must be dated at least twenty-two years earlier; that is to say in 1604. This document, discovered in the archives of Nordlingen, is a petition addressed on the 20th of January, 1604, to the council of that free imperial town, by a troupe of actors, probably English actors. The troupe asks leave to play among other pieces, "Romeo vundt Julitha," which it had already played at Ulm, at Heilbronn, and elsewhere, "with exceptional pleasure to the hearers."

Leo H. Grindon has published this year at Manchester "*The Shakespearian Flora*." The book is a pleasant successor to Ellacombe's exhaustive *Plant Lore and Garden Craft of Shakespeare*. Major Walker's *Shakespeare's Home and Rural Life*, presents a few aspects of the subject not mentioned by either of the authors named above. The director of the Botanic Gardens at Melbourne has been publishing *Notes on Shakespearian Botany* in an Australian newspaper.